

amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and request a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McMILLAN, ABERNETHY, WHITENER, NELSEN, BROYHILL of Virginia, and HARSHA.

There was no objection.

PUBLIC BROADCASTING ACT OF 1967

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 920 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 920

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6736) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now printed in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. After the passage of H.R. 6736, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 1160, and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 6736 as passed by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT): The gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTI] and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I first wish to yield 10 minutes to the able gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

(Mr. WRIGHT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WRIGHT was granted permission to speak out of order.)

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, today I want to say a few kind words for the President of the United States—both for the awesome office which has been so aptly described as the world's most "splendid misery," and for the extraordinarily hard-working human being who occupies that office.

Alexander Hamilton once warned of the paramount importance in a republic to guard not only against the government's oppression of its people, but also against the people's abuse of their leaders.

Just as our elected leadership was never to become lordly and officious, neither was it to be cowering, servile, and obsequious. The Nation's highest public office was not intended to become a public footmat. And the sacred right to criticize was not a license to villify.

History shows that, as a people, we have often taken Hamilton's advice rather badly. It seems, in fact, that our strongest and best Presidents are precisely those for whom we have reserved our bitterest hostility and our rankest abuse.

George Washington upon retiring from the office wrote to a friend that he would rather be in his grave than back in the White House suffering the monumental accusations and nasty personal innuendos to which he had been subjected.

Jefferson's detractors called him a "Jacobin" which, in the political lexicon of the time, was roughly tantamount to being branded a "socialist" or even a "Communist sympathizer" today. And one newsman prophesied in passionate, purple prose that:

The Republic is in the last stages . . . because that atheist from Virginia is in the White House.

Filthy stories were circulated about Andrew Jackson. He was falsely and blatantly accused of profiteering on Government contracts, and a large segment of the eastern press adopted the practice of snidely referring to him as "King Andrew."

No President was more unmercifully reviled—in the press, in the pulpit, on the street corners, and in the Halls of Congress—than Abraham Lincoln. He was scorned by his own generals and held in contempt by some in his own Cabinet. A review of the political cartoons of Lincoln's day would make even outspoken modern presidential critics blush over their surpassing bad taste.

Both Roosevelts were targets of the most vicious attacks. In 1908, a magazine called the American Businessman featured a cover picture of Theodore Roosevelt on which had been painted a crown, and editorially accused him of betraying his oath of office and of taking us down "the dead end path to socialism." Theodore, mind you.

How well we recall, though we try to

forget, the dirty, unfair things that were said about John F. Kennedy, including bitter attacks upon his personal motives. In the wake of the national trauma which followed his untimely assassination, we were shocked into a sort of temporary national shame. We seemed to realize how shabbily we had treated our finest and most dedicated Presidents. And we repented—for a few months.

Now the hounds of the hunt are baying again. The pack is in full cry. Our quadrennial silly season of orgiastic overstatement is approaching, and like some weird masochistic cult we find among us those who would turn upon our leader and devour him.

Hugh Sidey, writing in this week's issue of Life magazine, observes:

This has been a particularly virulent season. (President) Johnson has been denounced as untrustworthy, unimaginative, devious and dull.

Let me make it clear that I am not speaking of those people who criticize American policy responsibly and constructively. I am not talking of those who honestly and honorably disagree with the President on matters of opinion.

I am speaking of those who are forever assailing the President's motives, those who trade on fear and traffic in hatred. I am speaking of those who wallow in the gutter of personal abuse. I am speaking of those who superciliously set themselves above the President and sneer at his works, mistrust his words, belittle his deeds, and question his honor.

I am speaking of some urbane sophisticates who think they have discovered a safe and clever way to abuse the President's personal integrity by inventing a term they call a "credibility gap" and chattering about it incessantly in the hope that they thus can create a climate of disbelief between the American public and its elected leadership.

I am speaking of those who gleefully try to embarrass our President internationally by thwarting fulfillment of his international commitments, in the making of which he acted under the Constitution for all of us.

Once I spoke upon the floor of this House in defense of an international commitment of President Dwight D. Eisenhower. I said at that time that we have but one President at a time, and whether or not he belongs to my party, he is my President. When he is embarrassed, I am embarrassed because my country is embarrassed.

At that time I made this analogy: If we were flying over the ocean in an aircraft—and we may not have picked the pilot—we still would not pour water in the gasoline tank just to embarrass the pilot.

I felt that way when Mr. Eisenhower was President. I felt that way when Mr. Kennedy was President. And I feel that way when Lyndon B. Johnson is our President.

President Johnson's most partisan critics should remember that it was he, as Majority Leader of the Senate, who authored and effectively carried out the responsible bipartisan policy of supporting and upholding President Eisenhower

in his international dealings. Because of Lyndon Johnson's inherent sense of responsibility, there was no doubt anywhere on earth that, whatever our differences at home, this Nation faced the world united.

Never has a man come to the Presidency better grounded by experience in the intricacies of our Government than Lyndon B. Johnson. Never has a man devoted himself more dutifully to the office or at greater sacrifice of his personal repose. Never has a President worked longer hours or been more deeply dedicated to the fulfillment of his promises. And never has a President kept more of his promises to the people.

For more than a generation, every American President has spoken hopefully of medical care for the aged, of equalizing educational opportunity, of fairer treatment for the minorities, and of preserving our natural heritage. It remained for Lyndon Johnson to transform those dreams into realities.

And for these efforts, he is rewarded with abuse.

The white supremacists abuse him for doing more for civil rights than any President in history; and the black power militants catenate him for not having done the impossible, immediately.

The reactionaries flay him for producing the greatest volume of social legislation in history; and the so-called "New Left" ridicules him for preserving and honoring the very institutions and processes of our constitutional system which he is sworn to defend.

The bloodthirsty hawks scorn him for not having completely devastated North Vietnam and risked the outbreak of World War III; while the timid doves abuse him for not having cravenly abandoned an ally in its mortal struggle for freedom.

One extreme flails at the President for spending too much on Vietnam and too little on domestic programs; and another attacks him for devoting too much to domestic spending and too little to Vietnam. Surely they cannot both be right. Each is too eager to criticize and too reluctant to analyze.

Any President—and certain this President—deserves better than this. The very least we owe to any President is a modicum of understanding and an assumption of his good faith. At the very least, our propensities for partisanship and personal abuse should stop at the water's edge. In the counsels of the world, he is our spokesman. If we cannot uphold him, surely we should not undermine him.

There are, in all of this, two saving graces: while Americans historically have mercilessly abused our strongest and greatest Presidents throughout their terms in office, we seldom fail to reelect them.

And those whom partisan contemporaries most bitterly villify, history most firmly vindicates.

And so it will be, my friends, with Lyndon Baines Johnson.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 920 provides for consideration of H.R. 6736, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934. The resolution provides an open rule with two hours of

general debate, making it in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and provides further that, after the passage of H.R. 6736, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be discharged from further consideration of S. 1160, and it shall be in order to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 6736 as passed by the House.

H.R. 6736 would continue the program initiated under Public Law 87-447—the Facilities Act of 1962—whereby Federal matching funds are provided to help pay for noncommercial educational television broadcasting facilities and to extend it to noncommercial radio broadcast facilities; to provide funds—through a nonprofit private corporation—for cultural and educational programs of the highest quality so that the facilities provided under the bill can be productively utilized; and to provide for a study of instructional television.

There are approximately 745 commercial and noncommercial television stations now operating under licenses granted by the FCC. These stations broadcast over the very high frequency and ultra high frequency radio spectrum. The first noncommercial television station in the United States went on the air in May 1953.

Mr. Speaker, since we all delight in doing honor to those who deserve honor, I would not feel that it was proper to mention the subject without paying tribute, which I know is in the hearts of many Members of this House, to a great lady who was a member of the Federal Communications Commission, Frieda B. Hennock, who by the valiant fight she made year after year gained the allocation of a certain frequency in the television spectrum to noncommercial or to educational TV.

In the 9 years following 1953, only 80 additional educational television stations began broadcasting. During that period support for educational television came from local and State governments, businesses, schools and colleges, the general public, and private foundations, particularly the Ford Foundation. The 87th Congress enacted the Facilities Act of 1962 authorizing \$32 million in matching funds to be used for the acquisition and installation of new educational television broadcasting facilities over a 6-year period. Since that time the number of educational television stations on the air or under construction has more than doubled to 189. As a result educational television today reaches 155 million Americans.

The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 would continue to provide funds to acquire facilities for educational broadcasting. In addition, it would provide funds to assist in making programs of high quality available to local noncommercial educational broadcasting stations.

Thirty-two million dollars has been provided to date under the facilities act of 1962, and an additional \$38 million is provided under the bill for facilities. Without money for programs these fa-

cilities will lie idle much of the time, a monument to an unfulfilled promise. Most educational stations now maintain only limited broadcast schedules 5 days a week.

It is estimated that in 1967 commercial broadcasting stations will have revenues of \$4 billion, while noncommercial stations will have revenues of \$73 million. Title II of H.R. 6736 provides \$9 million in Federal funds to supplement the meager programming resources of local educational stations.

Mr. Speaker, these are the only funds which are authorized for the public nonprofit corporation, which is to aid in the provision of material to be used by non-commercial educational television stations.

Mr. Speaker, since I have had a long-time association with educational TV and radio and I am an ardent supporter of the enormous educational potential of educational TV and radio, I hope very strongly that this rule will be adopted and this measure will be enacted by the House.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the able gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD].

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I rise in support of both the rule and the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I believe today marks an important step forward in the field of educational television and radio broadcasting. In my opinion, the bill before the House today, H.R. 6736, is landmark legislation—legislation which will have an impact on the entire Nation and which will be remembered as one of the most significant achievements of the 90th Congress. The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 provides dramatic means to move ahead to new frontiers of educational television and radio.

In the public hearings on this bill before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, all the significant issues presented by this legislation were fully explored and discussed. The record of these hearings contains many diverse viewpoints of American society which reflect this country's growing need for a system of noncommercial broadcasting.

Major progress has been made in the field of noncommercial broadcasting over a relatively short span of time—enough progress to both reveal the promise of its potential and to indicate the chronic shortcomings—those of underfinancing, understaffing, and underprogramming. The strides which have been taken in the last 4 years in the area of educational television were made possible by the Educational Television Facilities Act of 1962. The impact of that bill on establishing and strengthening educational television broadcast stations has been gratifying. The present bill would extend the effectiveness of that impact and make possible a full noncommercial broadcast service to every family in the United States.

But the Public Broadcasting Act does not stop with merely extending coverage through support of new and existing facilities. This legislation provides the realization that the time has come to take steps to create higher quality and

more diverse programs. The influence of television is boundless. Television viewing alone occupies nearly one-fourth of the waking hours of the average American. We in Congress must face up to our responsibility to aid in the effort to produce a vital system of noncommercial educational broadcasting which will instruct, inspire, and enlighten the American people. This is our duty—to help the Nation take this step forward.

Briefly summarized, this bill has three parts. Title I has to do with increasing the coverage of noncommercial educational broadcasting by extending Federal support for construction of facilities. Title II is a proposal to establish a nonprofit, private corporation to improve the quality of educational and cultural programs and make them available to local stations upon their request. Title III would authorize a study of instructional television and other communications technology to determine their relationship to educational television and to the broad needs of formal education.

We have held extensive hearings on this legislation. We heard close to 80 witnesses. We sat in session well over 2 weeks and explored every detail of this bill. We listened attentively to all testimony and took careful note of all suggestions which were made. We weighed the evidence with great care and debated the crucial issues at length in executive session. The bill which you must consider today is the product of that extensive study. I will now outline the bill section by section in case you have any questions.

TITLE I

Under the provisions of title I, the bill will extend and improve the provisions of the Educational Television Facilities Act which expired at the end of fiscal 1967. Growth under that act was substantial. In 1962 there were 80 educational television stations in operation or under construction; today there are 130 on the air, 46 under construction, and 25 more represented by requests for grants.

The principal provisions of title I of H.R. 6736 will extend the ETV Facilities Act for 3 years through fiscal 1971. It will replace the \$1,000,000-per-State limit with an annual State limit of 8½ percent of the total appropriation for a given fiscal year. It will increase the maximum allowable Federal share in project costs from 50 percent to 75 percent, and it will delete the limitation that not more than 15 percent of any grant may be used for installation of interconnection facilities. For the first time, it will authorize grants to be made for construction of noncommercial radio broadcast facilities.

TITLE II

Title II of H.R. 6736 authorizes the establishment of a nongovernmental, nonprofit, private Corporation—the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. Among its function, the Corporation will provide operational and program support, through grants and contracts, to improve and strengthen local stations and to encourage diverse and high quality programming of regional and national interest. Although it will not own or operate any systems of interconnection or

program production facilities, the Corporation would be empowered to see that such services would be provided for the noncommercial educational broadcast stations. This would allow these stations to share in the benefits of networking without forcing them to accept programs for showing at fixed times. It would enable stations to receive and store programs for future use at the station's discretion.

The bill will authorize an appropriation of \$9,000,000 from the general tax fund to the Corporation for fiscal 1968. The President has indicated that following careful study and review he will make proposals next year for the continued financing of the Corporation. It should be pointed out that these Federal funds will be but one element in a broad-based pattern of financial support, combining State, local, and private funds with the Federal appropriations.

The bill contains guidelines to aid the Corporation in achieving its objectives and purposes. In an effort to clarify and strengthen these guidelines, the committee has adopted several key amendments. As originally submitted, the bill was titled "The Public Television Act" and the Corporation was to be known as the Corporation for Public Television. Since the bill is intended to assist noncommercial radio as well as television, the committee felt it was desirable to include both in the titles. Thus, it is proposed by amendment that the act be known as the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 and the Corporation as the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

H.R. 6736 retains the 15-member Board of Directors for the Corporation, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. However, as amended, the bill stipulates that no more than eight shall be of a given political party. This amendment reflects the concern that the Corporation must not become overwhelmingly an organ of one party or the other. Governmental and political interference or control must be kept at an absolute minimum. Along these same lines, the committee amended the section of title II pertaining to programming to provide for a strict balance between opposing viewpoints on controversial matters.

The fundamental purpose of the bill is to strengthen local noncommercial stations, and therefore the powers of the Corporation itself must not impinge on the autonomy of local stations. Local or regional educational broadcast stations must be free to accept or reject the programs and services which the Corporation will make available. This freedom is implicit in the station's license from the FCC.

The Corporation will be able to establish and maintain a library and archives of noncommercial educational television and radio programs and may inform the public about noncommercial educational broadcasting by various means including the publication of a journal. The committee thereby rejected the Senate amendment which would have limited the Corporation to the use of a journal alone.

The Corporation may arrange by grant or contract with the appropriate public

or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, or institutions for the distribution and transmission of educational television or radio programs to noncommercial educational broadcast stations. The committee again rejected a Senate amendment—one which would have allowed the Corporation to deal directly with the common carriers for interconnection facilities. In so doing, the committee sought to prevent the Corporation from directly involving itself in an operational area in which it could assert itself to the detriment of the local stations.

Here, as in title I, precautions have been taken to prevent the corporation from concentrating too large a portion of the available funds on an individual station or project. For fiscal 1968, no more than \$250,000 may go to any one station or to any one project.

TITLE III

Title III of H.R. 6736 authorizes an appropriation of \$500,000 for a study of instructional television broadcasting to include its relationship to educational television broadcasting. The Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will be empowered to conduct or to contract for such a study which will help in determining whether or not Federal aid should be provided for instructional television and, if so, how much and in what form. This study shall be submitted to the President for transmittal to the Congress on or before January 1, 1969.

It is clear that the role of television in relation to instruction requires a much broader assessment than has thus far been possible of the relation between our rapidly expanding communications technology and the full range of our educational needs. The development of television systems utilizing closed-circuit and 2,500-megacycle frequencies for instructional purposes is already underway in many schools and colleges. But this cannot be viewed in isolation. In raising the educational opportunities of this Nation, no resources should be left untapped, no advancement scorned, no opportunity wasted. As the Carnegie Commission report supplied many of the guidelines for this bill, so, too, it is hoped, will the study set up under title III provide meaningful guidelines for Federal aid to instructional broadcasting.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, I feel it is imperative to note that in our hearings on this bill, it was supported by all witnesses, representing many facets of the American society and economy. Although many variants of detail were proposed and discussed, some of which have been incorporated into the amendments offered by the committee, all who testified concurred that the needs to which this bill is directed are crucial and that the time to act to meet those needs is now.

(Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the able gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTAL).

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

(Mr. LATTA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the statements just made by the able gentleman from Florida, Mr. PEPPER, which pertain to the bill and to the resolution passed by the Rules Committee. There is very little opposition to this legislation, other than to the creation of this corporation. I shall, therefore, confine my remarks primarily to the corporation.

The purposes of the bill are: First, to continue the existing program of grants to noncommercial educational television stations and expand it to include noncommercial radio stations; second, to provide funds for an HEW study of instructional television, and; third, to provide funds for and to create a nonprofit corporation which will assist noncommercial television to produce and broadcast more quality shows of cultural and educational value.

Title I authorizes \$10,500,000 for fiscal 1968, \$12,500,000 for 1969, and \$15,000,000 for 1970 for the existing grant program to educational television. This program, administered by HEW has since 1962 made grants to some 161 stations throughout the country. Current law is amended to remove several features which have been found to be undesirable. The act provides that total grants in no State may exceed \$1,000,000. This dollar limitation is removed by the bill; in its place new language limits grants within a State to 8.5 percent of the appropriation in any fiscal year.

The act also limits an individual grant to a station to 50 percent of the cost of the project plus 25 percent of the cost of facilities owned by the applicant. New language will remove these two restrictions and substitute language will restrict the amount of a grant to 75 percent of the amount determined by the HEW to be the reasonable and necessary cost of the project. This language has been added because of the rapidly rising cost increase in getting an educational television station on the air.

Finally in title I, noncommercial radio stations are included among those eligible for grants, where only television operations had been eligible before. No money within the authorization is set aside for this project; HEW estimates that not more than \$500,000 will be required for fiscal 1968. There is no estimate for future years.

Title III provides for a study to be undertaken by HEW of instructional television and other audiovisual forms of instruction to see how these may be more fully developed. For this purpose \$500,000 is authorized. The study is to be completed and forwarded to the President and Congress by January 1, 1969.

Title II contains the new program for improving the present quality of television programs offered the American public. It creates a Corporation for Public Broadcasting to work for this end. The major unresolved issue is how to permanently finance its operation.

According to the report, all evidence clearly points out that the noncommercial

television stations cannot finance the effort necessary to make available more and better programming; and commercial television will not spend money on efforts with no mass appeal. Therefore, if the effort is to be undertaken the Federal Government must bear a major share of the load. This reasoning seems to have general agreement among the entire committee.

The Corporation will have a 15-member Board of Directors, appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate. Each will serve a staggered 6-year term; not more than eight may be from the same party. The bill provides authority for it to operate in three related fields to stimulate educational and cultural television programming on noncommercial television stations: First, it is authorized to make grants to local noncommercial educational stations so that they can produce and broadcast educational and cultural programs for their local audiences; second, it can make grants to production companies to employ writers, actors, et cetera, to develop and produce imaginative quality television programming which will be made available to noncommercial stations; and, third, it will provide financial assistance for interconnection. This last is to set up methods so that noncommercial stations can all be broadcasting a particular program at the time they desire, even with respect to live shows. The Corporation is not to create a network; it is prohibited from owning or operating any stations.

Other safeguards were written into the bill in the committee. The Corporation may not engage in any partisan political activity; nor may it "editorialize" on news or its views thereof.

Authorizations for title II are only for fiscal 1968—in the amount of \$9,000,000. The question of how to permanently finance the Corporation has not been settled, but will have to be next year. Estimates of costs run as high as \$160,000,000 per year by 1980. The report makes clear that financing by direct appropriations is not the preferred way and that possibly a trust fund—like the highway trust fund—should be created.

I do not know of any objection to the rule and urge its adoption.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. During the consideration of the bill by the Rules Committee, was any question raised as to why the commercial stations should not make a contribution toward the educational stations? The gentleman speaks about the taxpayer having to pay \$150 million or more eventually to this program.

I have never been able to understand the situation. I have been interested in a radio station, a smalltown station, for several years, until about a year ago. I have advocated on the floor many times that both radio and television stations should be paying for the privilege of using the air for their broadcasting.

The television stations in particular, when they get their licenses, are just like the taxpayers handing them \$5 to \$25 million to use.

There is no reason why the FCC could not be supported through fees from the radio and television stations, and there is no reason why the taxpayer should be saddled with an additional debt which should be paid by the industry itself.

Was that brought up before the Rules Committee?

Mr. LATTA. In answer to the question, this was discussed but not at length before the Rules Committee. As I understand it, it was discussed at length before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. When we get to the debate on the bill I will ask Members about that. I wanted to see if it had been called to the attention of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. In reply to the gentleman, CBS came before our committee and pledged \$1 million. NBC has not said that. ABC has not said that. We would hope that some of the funds would come from these corporations.

When we are talking about financing the Federal Communications Commission from fees, that is an entirely different problem which would have to be taken up by the committee on some other bill.

This has been up before the committee on a number of occasions, but we have never been able to get anything out of the committee which would place the responsibility upon the applicants to pay what I would consider adequate fees.

It is true that when they get an allocation a TV station is worth at least \$3 million the day it is allotted. There is some justification to what the gentleman has said.

In further reply, we have not been able to get anything out of the committee which, in my opinion, would pay the cost of the FCC.

May I say that the FCC handles other matters, for all kinds of long lines and other kinds of communications, which probably we should not tax. If the gentleman is asking only about the TV and radio stations, they ought to be paying their way.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am encouraged to know that one member of the committee agrees with me that they ought to be paying something.

Mr. SPRINGER. They do pay a license fee, but it is certainly not sufficient to pay the costs.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The people might misinterpret what the gentleman is saying. Just for the record, what is the license fee?

Mr. SPRINGER. It is quite small. I would guess it is not over \$300.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. \$300, regardless of whether it is a national broadcasting that covers the whole United States or a local station?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is very true. The applications for these radio and TV stations ought to be able to pay their own way, with an application fee which ought to cover the cost of processing that application and help to pay the cost of the FCC.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am glad to know that the gentleman agrees. I hope the gentleman will help us encourage other members of the committee to try to take some action to get some money into the Treasury, instead of giving away these valuable franchises.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Illinois for their comments.

I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the question that the gentleman from Missouri raised is particularly applicable here because it is possible some method such as he suggested could be found for financing the cost of educational television and radio as is contemplated in this legislation. However, in fact that method of financing does not exist. The administration was reluctant to come in with any recommendations in that area. As a matter of fact, this particular question was raised during the hearings as to whether we could not finance some of this program or perhaps all of it from some kind of use tax that would provide funds rather than going to the general appropriation route. But the whole question has been left in limbo. We will start a program in this legislation, perhaps, which has no foreseeable financing solution to it. This is one of the very basic problems and one of the big question marks in this legislation.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. As a member of the committee, would you be inclined to favor a policy of collecting some fees from the broadcasting industry?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As a member of the committee, I would feel a great deal more confident about this piece of legislation if we had some recommendation from the administration as to how it should be financed in the future, a future which, based on some of the studies made of this problem, may lead to a cost of \$270 million a year.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The thing about it is no administration, nor the opposing party, either, is going to try to touch these people because of the tremendous influence they exert. Everyone feels they should exercise a hands-off policy. I found very few people who will disagree with me that these broadcasting people, both in TV and radio, should be paying something for the exclusive monopolistic privileges they enjoy. I advocated that when I was in the business and had a small station. I said that even a small station such as I was in should be paying at least \$1,000 a year for its franchise and that the bigger stations should be paying up to \$1 million or more a year. They would still be getting a bargain and of course I am not suggesting that any station which is not making a profit should contribute.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is the gentleman suggesting that it is a lot easier to touch the American people as individuals for \$270 million a year than it is to try to touch a multibillion-dollar industry?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That is right. It is much easier.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am not sure that it is proper. I am not sure it is easy either way.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. It must be easier, or the committee would have done something about it.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, without going into the merits or the demerits of this program, I think we must stop for a minute now and consider the very serious and critical fiscal situation in which this Nation finds itself today.

In the House Committee on Ways and Means, of which I have the privilege of being a member, we have been tussling with the necessity of a tax increase in the light of a probable deficiency of \$29 billion by the end of this fiscal year.

How in the world—I repeat this—how in the world this Congress can entertain the idea of getting into any new programs at a time when we do not have the answer and apparently cannot find the answer to the fiscal dilemma in which we find ourselves, I just do not know. I would say that here in this particular program, recognizing that it will cost only \$9 million for the first year, but not knowing how it will be financed thereafter, that we should certainly stop to think of our sad fiscal condition before going into a new program. Why this House would embark or even consider this type of legislation under present circumstances I do not know.

What is it going to take to awaken this House of Representatives up to the fact that we are in serious fiscal trouble? If one does not believe that statement, come down to one of our committee hearings and listen to what the Secretary of the Treasury is saying, listen to what the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is saying and listen, if you will, to the "lip service" we are getting from the administration. And, further, if one does not believe we are in trouble, it is because he is living in a world of oblivion.

It is just not the time to start any new programs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think the answer to the gentleman's question is very simple: It is a lot easier for the Federal Government, the administration, and Members of this Congress to spend public money than it is to find ways by which to raise funds from taxpayers.

Mr. COLLIER. Of course, that is true. But that still does not provide an answer to a problem with which the Committee on Ways and Means is now working. I might say further that this is a problem with which the American people will not be too happy with the answer, if the answer is what it may have to be.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield further to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The tragic fact and answer, of course, is that we have an estimated \$30 billion deficit and the American people will get the bill for it later.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, may I say to my distinguished friend, I think possibly the Members of the Congress will wake up after November 1968 because it is my opinion the people of this Nation are beginning to wake up as to where we are going in the pursuit of our fiscal policy.

Mr. COLLIER. Let me say, forgetting the political implications, and for the good of the country, I hope it is before next year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

(Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the bill H.R. 6736 before us gives us an unparalleled opportunity to continue our pursuit of excellence. We can all concede that educational radio and television are an integral part of our national life. As the report points out, educational television now reaches 155 million Americans. The Facilities Act of 1962 has proven itself to be one of our most successful ventures in stimulating the creativity and imagination of America.

It is conceded by the three major commercial networks that educational broadcasting cannot be undertaken by them. We would as a nation be tragically remiss were we to turn aside from these gateways to the mind. We are not a static people. It is in the very nature of our being that we do not cast aside the tools that will help bring the gifts of learning gifts which will be repaid a millionfold—and I do not exaggerate—in the years to come. As Wordsworth said, "The child is father to the man."

Throughout this Nation there is a thirst for knowledge and learning. And it is upon this thirst that we must build, using every facility at our command. I do not think we will be able to measure the impact of what we do today, should we in our collective wisdom enact this legislation, for that which can appear to be just an ordinary day in the legislative process can for our future worth turn into one of truly magnificent achievement.

Perhaps the greatest benefits will be in the rural areas of the Nation and in the less wealthy States of our Union. It could well be that we are creating untold opportunities for the culturally deprived. If I sound overly enthusiastic, it is because it is my belief that no prospect can be more exciting and more challenging than the awakening and the cultivating of the mind.

I believe the grant formula adopted today is far more equitable and flexible than that of the 1962 act, and will secure the broadest possible distribution of these funds.

Another thought—it is estimated that commercial broadcasting stations in 1967 will have revenues of \$4 billion, while noncommercial stations will have revenues of \$73 million. This bill provides \$9 million in Federal funds to supplement the resources of local educational stations. Surely this is a most modest expenditure for so great a potential return.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I anticipate an excellence of performance from noncommercial educational radio and TV facilities. Unfortunately, our present system has not yielded the required spiritual, cultural, and educational excellence. The present system in its ineluctable but often questionable quest for revenue—and more and more revenue—must appeal to the masses—to the lowest common educational and cultural denominator of our people. This practice forces the chains and stations to sacrifice quality of program to the chase of the almighty dollar. It becomes a question of quantity of money as against quality of performance.

Creation of nonprofit, noncommercial stations as envisaged by the bill made in order by this rule will be of great comfort to the Nation. The \$9 million that will be spent for the first year and similar amounts for the second and third year would be a mere pittance, particularly when contemplated that our gross national product is approaching \$800 billion. A nation that can develop \$800 billion of goods and services should not hesitate for an instant to spend \$9 million or so for facilities that will be of such immeasurable value to the majority of the American people.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I warmly share and concur in the eloquence of the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6736) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 6736, with Mr. GALLAGHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I would like again to express my thanks and compliments to the members of the committee and especially the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], for their patience and help in considering this bill. This is a bill on which we had long hearings and which took a long time to mark up.

We had over 80 witnesses who appeared before our committee, from all phases of public and private life. All of those 80 witnesses were in favor of this bill with the exception of one.

When all the factors that have made the 20th century such a great century have been considered and entered on the ledger books of history and a balance struck, I believe that the peculiar mark of this century will be that of wireless broadcasting. Without it, I believe we would be living in an entirely different world today, without a great many of the advances that we have made.

Mr. Chairman, the bill we have before us is not entirely a new bill. It is a continuation—at least the first title of it is the continuation of a program we started some 4 or 5 years ago. It has worked out very well throughout the Nation. The authorizations have expired and we are back to extend them. I do not believe there is anyone who would say that they have not worked well.

I have a letter which was just handed to me from the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges of the United States. I would like to read just a part of it. There are two significant paragraphs that I think would mean something to each Member of this House because I know this association represents a university or a land-grant college, or both, in your State.

These parts of the letter read as follows:

The National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges would like to reemphasize its strong support for the passage of H.R. 6736, the Public Broadcasting Bill of 1967.

The Public Broadcasting Bill has been compared in importance to education in the United States to the Morrill Act of 1862 establishing the country's unique land grant system of colleges and universities.

We strongly urge your continued support for the legislation that would continue and accelerate the development of this unique educational resource.

I might say that there appeared before the committee two Governors, and eight others who gave their support in writing, endorsing the bill.

In my opinion, this is one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before the Congress this year. It is designed to strengthen noncommercial

educational television, one of the potentially most powerful tools of education enrichment and enlightenment in the history of our Nation.

The Congress already has displayed its concern for noncommercial educational television and, in 1962, amended the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for Federal financial assistance in the procurement and installation of educational television broadcasting equipment. These amendments are commonly referred to as the Educational Television Facilities Act of 1962.

H.R. 6736 will continue this program and, also, help provide desperately needed program assistance. In addition, it authorizes a study of instructional television.

There are three titles in the bill.

Title I extends the facilities act of 1962. It continues an existing program, with slight modifications, and there has been no controversy on this title.

Title II provides funds for the establishment of a nonprofit private corporation, insulated from Government control, through which will flow funds to provide high quality programs for use by local stations.

Title I addresses itself to construction; title II to programs.

There are two major areas of controversy involved with title II. One area is a concern, shared by all members of the committee, that the proposed Corporation could become an instrument for political propaganda. We think we have solved the problems with extensive legislative language in the bill. The second area of controversy has to do with the long-range financing of the Corporation. I will discuss that later.

Title III calls for an extensive study of instructional television by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

For fiscal year 1968, the bill provides \$20 million. Of this, \$10.5 million will be for matching funds under the noncontroversial title I to help build new noncommercial educational broadcasting stations.

Title II calls for \$9 million to provide program assistance for the stations through the new Corporation.

Title III calls for \$500,000 to finance a comprehensive and extensive study of instructional television.

In addition, H.R. 6736 as reported out by the committee calls for the authorization of \$12.5 million in fiscal year 1969 and \$15 million in fiscal year 1970 to be administered under the noncontroversial title I provisions to provide matching grants for construction.

This means, then, that the bill calls for a total of \$47.5 million—\$20 million in the first year under all three titles and an additional \$27.5 million in the following 2 years under title I.

Title I builds on provisions contained in the Educational Television Facilities Act of 1962, a previous amendment of the Communications Act of 1934.

Under provisions of the 1962 legislation, some \$32 million was administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the form of matching funds to help build or expand noncommercial educational television stations. The money, which was distributed

among 47 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, helped build 92 new stations and helped in the expansion of 69 stations.

The average grant in Federal funds was \$200,000.

Title I of H.R. 6736 makes noncommercial educational radio as well as noncommercial educational television eligible for matching construction funds.

The matching formula has been raised from 50 to 75 percent. Under provisions of the legislation, Federal funds are used for only part of the construction costs, specifically the acquisition and installation of transmission apparatus. It does not pay for land or for the housing of the apparatus. In most cases, the new formula of 75 percent still will amount to only 50 percent of the total costs of putting a new station on the air.

The 1962 act limited the total grants in any State to a dollar limit of \$1 million. Fifteen States received that maximum. H.R. 6736, as amended by the committee, replaces the dollar limitation with a percentage limitation. No more than 8½ percent of the appropriation for any fiscal year may be granted to any single State by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The new language is designed to permit flexibility while still guaranteeing a wide distribution of funds. The report accompanying the bill makes that doubly clear.

The appropriation of \$10.5 in fiscal year 1968 to finance title I would result in only a modest rate of expansion of the previous program. It would not even pay for the applications currently in hand at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Department estimates that the amount would help pay construction costs for about 24 more noncommercial educational broadcast stations.

The enactment of title I will permit even more Americans, particularly those in the rural areas, to receive the benefit of noncommercial educational broadcasting facilities. The committee agrees on the desirability of this goal and is confident that other Members will lend their support to it.

But the physical equipment for noncommercial educational broadcasting is not the entire picture. Testimony before our committee revealed a desperate need for funds to aid in the production of programs for use on those stations.

Under the Facilities Act, the Congress already has invested \$32 million in physical facilities. Under H.R. 6736, we stand ready to invest another \$38 million for physical facilities. But to spend \$70 million on physical facilities without providing for high quality programs would be like establishing a library without any print in the books.

Noncommercial stations have no advertising. They have no sponsors. A typical noncommercial educational television station has only \$100,000 a year to spend on programming. A sponsor on commercial network television would pay that much for only four 1-minute advertisements on "Batman."

Testimony before our committee repeatedly pointed to the many specialized unmet needs existing in communities

which would be served by an expanded and strong noncommercial broadcasting system with adequate program funds.

The stations could address themselves to the important but small audience. During a week, the number of small audiences would add up to a large audience. But they would be separate, small audiences with separate needs and requirements. Commercial broadcasting, on the other hand, feels compelled to search most of the time for the single large audience.

This is one of the reasons why the commercial broadcasters came before our committee and urged the adoption of H.R. 6736. The commercial broadcasters know that noncommercial stations can fill unmet needs. The presidents of all three major commercial television networks endorsed the bill. The president of the National Association of Broadcasters, which represents commercial broadcast stations, supported the bill.

This bill, after recognizing the need for Federal funds to aid in the production of programs, then addressed itself to solving the problem of how to administer Federal funds for broadcast programs while, at the same time, avoiding Federal control of those programs.

No one—the administration, the committee, the witnesses—wanted any hint of Federal control of broadcast programs to be permitted.

Accordingly, the legislation calls for the formation of a separate, nonprofit, private corporation to administer funds, both private and public, which will be used to provide high quality programs to the local stations. At all times the local stations have the right to accept or reject any program. The Corporation cannot require that a station broadcast any program. As required under present law, and as will be required under the new law, the sole responsibility for what goes out over the air rests upon the individual station licensee. This bill, I repeat, does not impair or affect the existing statutory duty and responsibility of the station licensee.

The 15 Directors of the Corporation, to be selected from eminent citizens by the President and subject to the advice and consent of the Senate, will serve 6-year terms. The terms will be staggered. None of the Directors may be a Government employee. In addition, the committee added a provision, under the sponsorship of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] that not more than eight of the Directors may be members of the same political party.

Existing language in the Communications Act of 1934, amended to reflect the provisions of H.R. 6736, guarantees repeatedly and strongly to local broadcast stations and systems a complete freedom from direction, supervision or control by the Federal Government. Throughout, H.R. 6736 contains language recognizing the existing statutory requirement that noncommercial educational broadcast stations are to exercise full autonomy.

Additionally, the committee added language that forbids the stations from editorializing and specifically calls for objectivity and balance in the presenta-

tion of controversial programs by local stations.

I might add that the restriction against editorializing is a requirement not imposed on commercial broadcast stations.

Still further, the stations to be served by this legislation are licensed by the Federal Communications Commission and are subject to the fairness doctrine and to the Communications Act of 1934.

I think we have solved the problem of any potential Federal control of the proposed Corporation or of any programs it will be supporting. After hearing lengthy testimony and discussion, most members of the committee feel we can conscientiously and firmly support the creation of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

The Corporation is to be a responsible, insulated, private, nonprofit organization, chartered under provisions of the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act. It will be fiscally accountable. The bill requires an annual audit of the accounts of the Corporation by independent public accountants and authorizes the Comptroller General of the United States to audit and examine the Corporation's records. The financial reports are to be submitted annually to Congress.

The Corporation is specifically forbidden from owning or operating any broadcast station, system, network or interconnection or program production facility.

The Corporation has the power to make contracts with, or grants to, existing and new noncommercial educational broadcast stations to existing and new production entities and to individuals for the production of educational programs.

Also, it may make payments to stations to aid in the financing of programming costs, particularly innovative approaches, and to aid in the financing of other costs of operations.

By these and other means provided in the bill, the Corporation will assist in the creation and distribution of programs of high quality obtained from diverse sources. The programs will be made available to the stations, but the stations may refuse or accept them. The stations may fix the broadcast time for any programs they may choose to put on the air.

It is expected that the Corporation will make its grants, contracts, and payments in such a manner as not to permit any recipient to serve as a mere conduit of Federal funds to commercial program suppliers.

The Corporation is to carry out its activities in ways that will effectively assure the maximum freedom of the noncommercial educational broadcast systems and stations from interference with, or control of, program content or other activities.

In order to assure a wide distribution of funds from the relatively limited amount to be made available in the first year to the Corporation, the bill calls for a limitation of \$250,000 for any one project or to any one station from the appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

However, there remains additional controversy concerning title II, and that controversy has to do with the long-range financing of the Corporation.

H.R. 6736 authorizes, for 1 year only, the expenditure of \$9 million to finance the activities of the Corporation for the benefit of the local noncommercial educational broadcast stations.

All of us recognize that this is only "seed money," vitally needed to get the Corporation into operation. Such a commitment to the program needs of noncommercial broadcast stations is long overdue.

As Thomas Jefferson said in 1786:

The most important bill is that for the diffusion of knowledge among the people. No other sure foundation can be devised for the preservation of freedom and happiness.

We are in urgent need of knowledge and information, of education and instruction. Noncommercial educational broadcasting, with its ability to reach many specialized groups, can be a powerful tool in bringing a world of education and instruction and knowledge and information and art to the people. It is time we brought these benefits to all the people, in every State.

Now is the time to take this step.

However, certain members of the minority on the committee have expressed their concerns about the long-range financing of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

We simply do not know what the financial needs of noncommercial broadcasting will be in the distant future. No one can know. We do not know how many stations will be on the air. We do not know what the expenses of operating those stations will be. We do not know what technical developments are in store. We do not know the extent of the commitment that the Nation will wish to make to noncommercial educational broadcasting.

We have estimates. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates that the budget of the Corporation in 1980 should be about \$160 million a year. The report of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television, on which some of this legislation is based, assumes an ideal model of 380 television stations by 1980. This ideal would require about \$270 million a year, of which \$104 million would be provided by the Corporation.

Both these estimates are assumptions, of course, although based on detailed studies that call for a strong, true, nationwide service to the Nation's broadcast audience.

Our committee believes it is perfectly workable to establish the Corporation under title II of H.R. 6736 with 1 year's financing and solve the issue of long-range funding after solid experience and further study.

Since there are no precedents upon which to base judgments at this time, a clearer view as to future needs can best be obtained after the Corporation has gained operational experience.

This is in line with the President's request in his February health and education message to the Congress. The

President recommended the establishment of the Corporation and added that—

Next year, after careful review, I will make further proposals for the Corporation's long-term financing.

Meanwhile, the private community stands ready to support the Corporation. Dr. James T. Killian, testifying as chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television, told our committee that he is confident \$25 million will be donated to the Corporation in its first year after inception. Dr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, repeated his assurance that CBS would donate \$1 million when the Corporation is established. The Communications Workers of America have offered \$100,000 to the Corporation.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. When CBS said they would be willing to contribute \$1 million, did that mean the entire network or each of the stations they operate?

Mr. STAGGERS. That would be the network.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The whole network?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. They were generous, very generous.

Mr. STAGGERS. I thought so. If we could get the others to contribute, it would be of great assistance. Maybe we could get them to contribute a little later. We hope so. A committee of eminent business and professional people in America has been set up to get public subscriptions for this proposal.

Mr. Thomas Hoving, director of New York's Metropolitan Museum of Art testified that he heads a new committee of prominent persons, The National Citizens Committee for Public Television, which was organized to make a concerted effort to raise money from private sources for public broadcasting.

By providing for the Corporation to be established and thus proceeding to meet the urgent program needs of noncommercial educational broadcast stations, we also can set the forces into motion that will bring in funds from nongovernmental sources. Within a year, we will have a much better idea of precisely what the private contributions may be and what share the Federal Government may be called upon to support.

In our committee report, separate views of the minority, including the minority leader, support this legislation, including the establishment of the Corporation. The separate views, however, emphasize the need to get the question of long-term financing settled within the next year. The report also contains the minority views of six members who indicate their unwillingness to proceed with the title II provisions because of the question of long-range financing.

But now is the time to establish this Corporation. Now is the time to take advantage of the millions of public funds

already invested in the construction of noncommercial educational broadcast stations. Let us proceed, take advantage of a year's experience, and await the report of the President.

It is a big step, yes. It is bold and imaginative, significant, and urgent. Yes, this may be one of the most important pieces of legislation to be considered by the Congress this year.

Finally, title III of the bill also is one, like title I, that comes to you without controversy. It authorizes \$500,000 for a study by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of instructional television—better known as classroom television. The study would determine whether Federal aid should be provided for instructional television, what form it should take, how such broadcasting activity should be used. The study is to be submitted to the President for transmittal to the Congress on or before January 1, 1969.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I am voting in favor of this bill known as the Public Broadcasting Act because I believe it will fulfill many promises that television and radio offer all Americans.

This bill creates a nonprofit federally chartered Corporation for Public Broadcasting which will be a nongovernmental institution, free of political interference and control.

The Corporation will be authorized to appropriate funds to create programs of educational and cultural value for all Americans.

Many days of hearings were held by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which I am the ranking member, to consider this bill and the need for such legislation. I wish every Member of this House had been able to attend those hearings and learn as I did the wonderful improvements in broadcasting which will be realized as a result of this bill.

At those hearings this bill was not only endorsed by educators, prominent businessmen, bankers, union leaders, and writers; but it was soundly endorsed by the presidents of each of the three commercial television networks as well as the president of the National Association of Broadcasters.

Basically, this bill recognizes that the commercial networks have done their best to provide varied programs for all viewers but that the economics of commercial broadcasting severely limit the ability of the networks and stations to present programs which many minority audiences would enjoy.

It is the intention of the bill to make available funds for a great variety of enlightening programs, including public forums, drama, musical performances as well as televised formal and informal educational instruction.

This bill recognizes that television and radio in this country are no longer in their infancy and audiences have become sophisticated and require varied and serious programs as well as the enter-

tainment and amusement furnished by commercial broadcasting.

The bill continues the matching funds program whereby local educational television stations will receive Federal assistance in building and equipping their stations. It is beyond any reasonable doubt that the richest country in the world cannot afford not to equip its citizens, young and old, with all the advantages that modern technology can bring. We cannot afford to be any less than the best informed people in the world. In my opinion this bill is an important step in keeping the entire American public enlightened and educated.

I am pleased that the legislature of my own State has recently created an educational TV authority. The executive director of that agency testified at the hearings in favor of this bill. I am hopeful that this agency and many other similar groups in the country will receive the program assistance they need through the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

These are particularly difficult times for Americans. They are being called upon to assist peoples all over the world. Yet we cannot turn our backs on our own people right here at home or to their needs and their hopes for a better world for themselves and their families. Never was there a time when they more needed to understand and enjoy the people, the wonders and beauties of their land, as well as the lands of others.

Unfortunately, it costs money—great sums of it—to bring to American homes meaningful creative effort via the public airwaves. Private sources of all kinds have attempted to finance this type of creative effort. However, this support has provided but a meager fraction of what must be contributed if all of us are to receive the benefits of such creative efforts. H.R. 6736 is a historic proposal—it would take a giant step forward in helping us to realize the goal of a more informed and enlightened people. I believe the Corporation for Public Broadcasting is the type of imaginative and creative step that leads in the right direction.

President Johnson has deemed the concept of a public broadcasting corporation important enough that passage of this legislation ranks high on his list of priorities for the American people. I hope all of my colleagues will join with me in helping to make the dream of a worthwhile, uplifting educational broadcasting a reality.

(Mr. FRIEDEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, in closing I would like to say this: Let us get started on a project that should be as inspiring to every Member of the House, as it should be serviceable to the land in the future. Now is the time and opportunity to do something.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I heard the question asked of the gentleman from Ohio a minute ago whether

any consideration had been given in the Rules Committee.

Now I ask: Was any consideration given in the gentleman's committee to raising the money through a system of fees or licenses paid by radio and television stations which now are operating on licenses which are invaluable, which are worth far more than the physical assets of the stations themselves? Was any thought given to that?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes, there was.

We are not now, in this bill, providing anything in that regard.

The Congress will have to take another look at this. I assure the gentleman there will be a long, hard look at this when it comes before the committee.

This and other means were discussed, such as excise taxes on TV sets and various other ways.

There is no provision in this bill for financing the Corporation in the future. It was not asked for and we did not want to go out and say, "we are going to provide it now."

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Does the gentleman mean to tell me that his committee never takes any initiative, that it only puts out what people ask for?

Mr. STAGGERS. The gentleman is misinterpreting my remarks. I said it was not requested. The gentleman does not know what is required, and we do not know.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman is asking us to commit the taxpayers of America to spend, I believe, up to \$38 million.

Mr. STAGGERS. Over a 3-year period.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Over a 3-year period.

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. It does call for spending that much money.

Mr. STAGGERS. That is a continuation of a program which I expect the gentleman voted for in 1962. A great majority of the Congress did. It might have been a unanimous vote; I do not know. It is a continuation of that program.

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Does the gentleman believe it is out of order for him, as chairman, or for his committee, to recommend to the Federal Communications Commission that we are unhappy about the present situation, in that so little money has been contributed by the commercial broadcasting companies of both television and radio, and therefore it is our desire that they should make a study as to what would be a more equitable method whereby the commercial broadcasters would contribute toward the maintenance and the building of public educational broadcasting?

I should like to have the reaction of the gentleman to that.

Mr. STAGGERS. I understand what the gentleman is talking about. That subject is not before our committee, and will not come up until next year. Every avenue would be gone into at that time.

Mr. FARBSTAIN. I am talking about

the subject generally. Why cannot the committee, independently of what has been presented to it by the administration, pass a resolution to the effect that the Federal Communications Commission shall make a study?

Mr. STAGGERS. If the gentleman is talking about the long-range financing of the Corporation, the subject is not before us and it will not be before him or me until next year. The gentleman does not know, and I do not know, and no one else knows what is the proper solution. We will investigate every aspect of financing the Corporation.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. Is it not true that before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce should undertake the position of a schedule of fees for the licensees of the Commission it should first undertake a rather comprehensive study of the financial conditions of the many licensees?

The gentleman from Missouri has mentioned the great values involved. I believe he used the word "invaluable."

I concur. Some of the licenses are invaluable.

Some of them are very marginal in operation.

There are many types of licensees of the Commission engaged in the field of commercial broadcasting. If there is a channel in one of the top 100 markets, we are talking of values running anywhere from \$10 million to \$20 million. That is far in excess of the value of the physical plant.

On the other hand, a broadcaster operating a radio station in a small community may be having a difficult time breaking even. So, if the committee is to take the initiative, it should be taken in a responsible manner, after appropriate hearings into that as a separate legislative subject.

It happens I do not disagree with the gentleman's urging that the Congress consider the imposition of fees for the use of the very valuable public property of the broadcast spectrum, but this is not the vehicle. I am not aware at the moment that any Member has introduced or referred to the committee a proposed schedule of fees. It would be a desirable first step and one that I would certainly be very happy as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to support.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my chairman for yielding.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, we have a very fine educational nonprofit television station called channel 13 in New York City. I am curious to know how that station would be aided under this bill. What process would be undertaken and how would money be siphoned into that organization if it needs funds? How would it be done?

Mr. STAGGERS. There are other stations similar to this. They will all be eligible for assistance under this legislation.

Mr. CELLER. In other words, I am very happy to contribute to that organization. Many in New York have done likewise. But the time must come when they face deficits. If they face a deficit, they could make an application for a grant. Is that how it would be done?

Mr. STAGGERS. This legislation would permit the Corporation to make such a grant. Whether it would or not in any particular case would be up to the Corporation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in 1961 educational broadcasting was in a bad way. Struggling along for 9 years, it had come forth with but 80 stations in the entire country, and the effort seemed to be headed for oblivion unless more and better stations could be created. To assist in this effort Congress provided \$32 million to be used over the course of 5 years for construction of educational TV stations. No more than \$1 million could be used in any one State.

Apparently this nudge was the needed incentive for private and local government money to come forth. Fifteen States have used the entire \$1 million to which they could lay claim. Only three States have used none at all. The number of stations on the air or under construction now totals 189. The money put forth by the Federal Government helped to build 92 new stations and expand and improve 47 others. Grants ranged from \$14,000 to \$777,000. Because many communities or schools were trying to put a station on the air and had acquired some of the new equipment or facilities, they were given credit for those things and then a 50 percent grant.

Title I of the bill we are considering today is an extension of this very program. The country needs many more educational stations, perhaps as many as 380. The Federal aid is justified, and this bill would allow for another 3 years for grants up to 75 percent of approved items. The percentage increase is required because the new stations will all be from scratch. When taking into account the items not approvable, the funds will work out to just about 50 percent of most projects. Additionally, the advent of color puts an added strain upon the pocketbooks of the communities or institutions building the stations.

Some of the States have linked their educational stations together in a statewide network to get better use of the actual educational potential on the broadest basis possible. One State took its entire \$1 million and merely divided it by the number of stations it felt the State needed. In this case, the Federal funds were a minute portion of the funds spent to create the system. But it helped. In the bill before us today we provide \$10.5 million for 1968, \$12.5 million for 1969, and \$15 million for 1970. These are comparatively modest sums, but if past experience is any guide they should stimulate the creation of many more stations very quickly. And for the first time we have included radio stations.

Such is title I of this bill. It can be defended and heartily endorsed by anyone who studies the program and the need. I recommend it to the House.

Over the years, one of the greatest problems in operating an educational station has been the creation or acquiring of enough appropriate programming to make a full schedule. Aside from purely instructional material, it has been most difficult. Assistance has come for the most part from foundations, particularly national educational television, an offshoot of the Ford Foundation. This organization has spent millions in the preparation of programming for noncommercial station use.

Title II of this bill addresses itself to the same problem. The proposal which has already been outlined for you has been the subject of much conversation and writing since it was suggested by the Carnegie Foundation study last year. To its proponents it would be the answer to everything that is deficient in commercial programming. It would be the great enlightener and culture purveyor as well as classroom tool. These people see it as a pioneer and crusader. I must admit that I have some healthy misgivings about charging too rapidly down that road.

To those who are suspicious of such an effort it has the potential to become either a giant, Government-controlled propaganda machine or a fourth national network destined to fill the air with more of the same. In the latter case, the air might not be able to stand the strain.

It has been my intention to make this idea workable if possible. It has been the aim of our committee. And I think that by and large it has succeeded. In such a venture there are always unknowns, and I would not predict unqualified success, but I think it can be safely said that there is no longer a likelihood that it will get out of hand as some have feared. The safeguards put in the bill should let the good things happen if they can and stop the bad before they can get moving. Just let me briefly recite the things that have been put into this bill which make me so confident.

One of the main concerns has been the possibility that the Corporation might wind up in the middle of politics. The first change made to eliminate such a possibility was an amendment to provide that no more than eight of the directors of the Corporation can come from one political party. This is the same arrangement which keeps our regulatory agencies balanced. This is the scheme that makes our congressional committees work reasonably well and, I think, in the interests of the country. The minority and the majority act as a curb on each other, ready to blow the whistle at the least suggestion of undue partisan activity. I know that there are plenty of well-qualified individuals to serve on such a board of directors, and I would have considerable faith that the policies of such a board would not go hog wild.

The bill in its original form excluded the Corporation from actual political activity. This did not go far enough to make sure that stations individually or in concert, such as a State network,

might not take on issues and be the center of political activity in the broadest sense. Although commercial stations can and are encouraged to editorialize, the committee considered it inappropriate for educational stations to do so, and the bill forbids it.

And at this point I would like to remind you that all of the sections of the Federal Communications Act apply to noncommercial stations—the fairness doctrine, the equal time provisions and all.

In addition to making sure of a bipartisan board of directors, the powers of the board were well hedged. There is a limit on how much Federal money can be put in any one project. The Corporation can do nothing that would remotely resemble the operation of a network. For example, it can have no direct dealings with the common carriers which lease cable for station interconnections. In this way it cannot create the full interconnection among stations which is needed to keep a network together. Some programs may be shown on many stations at one time, but the arrangements for it will be made through the contractors which prepare the programs.

The Corporation is not going to keep any of the trappings of program production. It will own no studios and hire no acting talent. Programs will be prepared under contract only. Noncommercial stations will continue to belong to the communities or institutions which build them and will be entirely independent of the Corporation. Any station may use or reject any piece of program material as it sees fit. If it accepts it, there is no restriction as to how it will be used. For example, a documentary may be offered for simultaneous showing and funds provided for the necessary hookup to do so. Station X can join in or it can take the show for a later showing according to its own programming needs or desires.

So the Corporation has been fairly well hemmed in and the stations kept out of its clutches. Even so, different people see this whole effort in different lights. To some, in fact some members of our committee, the main purpose for any such system is to provide far more classroom instructional broadcasting. Certainly television and radio have but scratched the surface in this area and can be developed into a very potent force in formal education.

Some people see the main thrust of this effort to be a sort of semiformal adult education where programs for specific subject matter and educational goals is presented in a series form, each segment building on the former.

Some people see it as education by presentation of better material of a cultural nature such as Shakespeare and the symphony orchestras.

Some see it as the intellectual needler which presents penetrating and thought-provoking documentaries and discussion programs.

In a way every point of view is correct. There is undoubtedly room in the broad reach of broadcasting to do an adequate job in all these departments. I sincerely hope it does. I would not like to see it confined to any one category.

This leaves one knotty problem about which you will hear much this after-

noon—how are we going to finance this effort over the long pull. The \$9 million included in title II is obviously a drop in the proverbial bucket to approach the problems and promise of public broadcasting. If it is to do any of the things we have discussed, the money necessary for program origination will be considerable. The foundations which have studied the problem estimate the amount from \$60 million to \$270 million a year eventually. Of course, any amount properly spent can help, and that is partly what prompts me to support the bill as it now stands. No doubt there will be some private money from direct contributions and from foundations to assist the corporation. Everyone involved has stated, however, that substantial amounts of Federal money will be required.

At the present time we do not know what the administration proposes either as to method of providing Government funds or the level of expenditure contemplated. This is a serious weakness. It means that we must do this far-reaching and important job partially blindfolded. As for me, I have convinced myself that the good which can accrue to our educational stations demands that we go ahead. No one should commit himself at this point to any financing scheme. There may be a rousing fight on that issue when the time comes—and come it must. The administration should come forth very early with its recommendations so that all here can give them thorough study and deep thought before acting. Any attempt to rush something through should be rejected.

It is my opinion that the only alternative to financing the Corporation is appropriated funds. This presents certain dangers and drawbacks, and all other proposed methods so far present other problems. It will be a man-sized job to maintain the principle of independence of action for the Corporation while holding the life and death purse-string. That will be the next chapter in the drama of public television and will be played on this station next season.

For the present we can create the major machinery and see how it functions. I therefore recommend the legislation to the House.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. In connection with your comment on editorializing, I can understand your position that you do not want any station to be used for partisan politics, and yet at the same time if you say that no station may engage in editorializing, I think that you are limiting that station or excluding them from engaging in one of the most valuable things that could come from such a station. Your commercial stations are reluctant to provide the time for editorializing, particularly on community projects and things like that.

As long as you can have editorializing, and safeguard that by offering equal time to the other side of the question, I do not think that would affect what you are trying to reach.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I answer the gentleman on that question, first?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. SPRINGER. First, we shall divide it into two parts. On the question of editorializing, I did not want any station to get in the position which occurred in my State last year, where they took the TV station and endorsed one candidate for Congress and took the radio station and endorsed the other. In the first place, I do not think they ought to be in the position of endorsing or rejecting any candidate for office. I say that for commercial as well as educational and non-commercial TV. I do not think they ought to be in that field.

We do lay ourselves open to this kind of possibility if we do not close this loophole now.

Educational and noncommercial television came in and said, "We want to stay out of this field."

For instance, if we do a documentary on our hometown—does the gentleman come from Cape Girardeau?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I come from a small town; Cape Girardeau is the metropolis of the district I represent.

Mr. SPRINGER. Well, let us say Cape Girardeau ran a program in depth on a certain type of housing. This does not remove from educational television the necessity under the fairness doctrine to allow the same amount of time for the opposite opinion.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. But when we get into that, we get into editorializing, if the station puts on a program advocating changes.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is a different thing from preventing a documentary in depth which might present certain facts that look like an opinion, but they could not get into the field of editorializing. A documentary in depth is one thing that I say in the future I want to keep my finger on, and I have watched my home station very carefully on this. It seems to me the documentaries I have seen thus far have been pretty good. Some of them I may not agree with, but I think the documentaries in depth where fairly presented. We would want to be sure that the fairness doctrine operates.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That is true, but unless we have it described more detailed than I see in the bill itself, we are going to limit that station in the presentation of information which I think their audiences should have.

Mr. SPRINGER. The only thing I can say in reply to the gentleman, if the gentleman is saying editorials are the kind of information they should have, we do prevent it.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. But if we offer the opportunity for a rebuttal to that—in other words, I have confidence in the public as long as they get both sides of the question. I think they should have the opportunity to do that.

Mr. SPRINGER. There is nothing that would prevent the presentation or a demand for equal time.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chair-

man, I agree with the gentleman from Illinois. I think what the gentleman from Missouri is saying would not be prohibited at all. This would be one of the functions of educational TV, to present programs where both sides of a question that was interesting and vital to a community could be presented. But it would not be done in an editorial form. It would be done in a proper forum where both sides are present and they have a discussion, as I think the gentleman would prefer to have it done.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think the question may be one of semantics.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I think it is.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. It is a question of what we determine and consider to be editorials. What I fall out with is when a newspaper editorializes in its news columns, and that is given, and they slip a needle in before we know what has happened, and we do not have a chance to answer that. That is editorializing in the worst form. It is the thing I do not condone. I would like to see it kept out.

But I would like to see the educational station editorializing to the extent of advocating improvements in the community and things like that. At the same time, I am not arguing with the gentleman about the equal-time business, because I know we are going to do that, or at least I think we are, and we are going to assure that. But I do not think we should limit editorializing without making some legislative history as to what we mean by it.

Mr. SPRINGER. We went over that with our counsel in every way, and we could not come up with any language we thought was meaningful on this.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. MIZE. How broad a control does the gentleman envisage this new corporation, which is to be established under title II, will have over programing, for all the individual stations?

Mr. SPRINGER. That was a part I could not get into in depth. It is a big subject. It would take some time to explain it.

Briefly, I can say that we provide that the corporation cannot be a network. Interconnections are allowed on a spot basis only. In the first place, they do not have the money. We do provide if there is a national program of significance it would be possible for the corporation to enter into a contract indirectly with a communicating agency which could transmit the program. That is what we in effect provide.

If anyone wants to take the program, he can. If Kansas wants to take it and Illinois does not, that is perfectly all right.

That is as near as we come to what I would call a national program. Otherwise, it is shipped out in cans and they present it at the day and hour they want on the particular stations.

Mr. MIZE. Will individual stations be permitted to develop their own instructional programs?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes; if they have the means. But a local station does not have

to take anything from outside sources it does not want. It is purely up to them.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I believe it should be made clear that the corporation as such will have no control. The committee was very specific about this. The gentleman from Illinois was one of the biggest boosters of this point of view. All of us were concerned to make sure that this corporation would have no control. It cannot make anybody take or use a program. All the freedom is guaranteed in the bill for the individual station. They can use a program which may have been sponsored to be produced, but no one can force an individual station to produce or use anything.

Mr. SPRINGER. Or to show anything.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I should like to mention one point that came into the gentleman's remarks, on the ultimate cost of this program.

I have before me "Public Television: A Program for Action," the report of the Carnegie Commission for educational television. In this booklet, which I understand is the bible of this whole program, or at least a testament for this program, the figure consistently used as the total ultimate operating cost of this program is \$270 million, when 380 stations get on the line.

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, but at this point we have less than half that number of stations.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The ultimate figure we are talking about is \$270 million per year.

Mr. SPRINGER. I would guess that is about right. That would be about the same proportionate cost we have at the present time, considering the number of stations.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. This is for consideration in the future, but on the question of cost has the committee considered the fact that the commercial facilities, the radio and TV stations and networks, do not pay any license which is meaningful, and they really are getting a very valuable commodity?

Mr. SPRINGER. Earlier in the day, I say to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Jones] propounded this question, and I agreed with him they were not paying as much as they ought to be paying, considering the value of what they get from a license for a radio or TV station.

Mr. JOELSON. I thank the gentleman.

(Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

(Mr. JOELSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong and enthusiastic support of this beginning of Government recognition of the importance of nonprofit educational TV. It seems that television has never realized its potential. In fact, we are a Nation where we have great technocracy, but our technocracy has by far outrun our good taste and our sense of values.

Think what we can do. We can sit in our living room, turn a switch and see and hear things that are happening across the Nation across the world. But what do we get? Banal, vapid, mediocre pablum.

This bill is a step in the direction of realizing the great potential of television. When in later years we get to the question of financing, if I am in this body, I will certainly urge that commercial stations pay the freight. We give them something which is very valuable. We give them a virtual monopoly. They need not be told by the Government how much they can charge. They charge sponsors whatever they can get. And they do not even pay the cost of their regulation. A barber has to pay a meaningful license fee. A saloonkeeper has to. You name it. If they are licensed, they have to pay at least enough to pay for the cost of their regulation. But we give the people's airwaves for sale by radio and television stations. They sell it and they do not pay a cent for it. Can you imagine if we took Government lands or Government timber and said to some private developer, "It is yours; you can take it for nothing"? It would be called a giveaway. We are giving away something of value here to the television and radio people, and they should pay for it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I hasten to point out that when this program gets rolling we will have 380 educational television stations plus an undetermined number of radio stations which will be provided for under new provisions of title I. There will then no longer be a monopoly by some private broadcasters because that number of 380 educational stations will be the equivalent of both the NBC and CBS network stations put together. I gather that the gentleman is advocating that we take money from the present networks and stations on the network to set up the competitive stations which would be comparable in number to the combined size of NBC and CBS.

Mr. JOELSON. Yes. I do not agree with the Carnegie Commission recommendation that would finance this by an excise tax on television sets. I do not think that is the way the money should be raised, but think that the television networks that are getting something valuable from the Government should pay for it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE].

(Mr. DEVINE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, this is a

highly technical and complicated subject, and in my few minutes here today I will merely attempt to bring it down to a layman's understanding of what this legislation does.

H.R. 6736 is important legislation. It amends the Communications Act of 1934. It also provides grants for the construction of educational television and broadcasting facilities. It authorizes assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting for the first time and establishes a nonprofit organization designed to assist in establishing "innovative educational programs." It creates a public corporation, which I think is an objectionable feature of this bill. There will be an amendment offered at a later time to strike out that public corporation, title II, of the bill. Finally, it authorizes a comprehensive study of instructional TV and radio.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] mentioned that the Armed Services Committee is already spending a great deal of time and some funds to make similar studies in the same general field.

The reported purposes of this legislation are, first, to continue the program that was initiated under the law we passed in 1962. I think it is Public Law 87-447. That did not pass, incidentally, unanimously in the House. I think there were about 68 votes against it and 330-something in favor of it.

Under that law we provided matching Federal funds to help pay for noncommercial educational TV broadcasting facilities and for other purposes, to extend this to radio, and also to provide funds for cultural and educational programs through a private corporation; again, I say, and to provide for a study of instructional television.

Mr. Chairman, since the first noncommercial TV station went on the air in 1953, up until we passed this law in 1962, 80 additional TV stations began broadcasting. In the 5 years since this law went into effect in 1962, up until now, we have more than doubled that number. There are 189 as a result of which educational TV now reaches approximately 155 million people.

Mr. Chairman, according to the testimony of the witnesses, the enactment of this bill today is designed to assist in making programs of what they call "high quality." That is to provide excellence of production, excellence of programming and excellence of facilities that are now enjoyed by the commercial television networks.

Mr. Chairman, title II of this bill provides \$9 million in Federal funds as "seed money" and also organized a corporation to provide program assistance by grants and contracts to support local innovative programs, grants and contracts for the production of programs and the creation of programs which will be made available to local stations. And, one of the sales points is this. This appears, I believe, at the bottom of page 10 of the committee report, and I quote:

Who can estimate the value of a democracy of a citizenry that is kept fully and fairly informed as to the important issues of our times and whose children have access to programs which make learning a pleasure?

Then, it goes on to say as follows:

The program support provided by title II of the bill will, among other things, enable the noncommercial educational broadcast stations to provide supplementary analysis of the meaning of events already covered by commercial newscasters.

I repeat, "enable the noncommercial educational broadcast stations to provide supplementary analysis of the meaning of events already covered by commercial newscasters."

Mr. Chairman, I understand that there is one educational TV station out on the west coast that a bunch of "hippies" are running. Someone has suggested that it would indeed be amazing to hear the type of analysis they are making with reference to these matters. This is one of the areas in which we have had to work very hard in order to try to provide some safeguards. And, along this line, I want to say that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] has done a meaningful job in this particular area in an effort to correct those deficiencies that appeared in title II of this bill. But, as I said, we think it would be a better bill without title II entirely.

Mr. Chairman, the report says:

Economic realities of commercial broadcasting do not permit widespread commercial production and distribution of educational and cultural programs which do not have a mass audience appeal.

Admitting then that programing under this act will be aimed at a rather special kind of audience, the proponents claim that "now is the time when educational broadcasting stations should be supplied with programs of a diverse, cultural, and educational nature," and they go on to say, "We are at the threshold of new, exciting, and worthwhile advances" in instructional television and that now it is possible "to relieve educators from dissipating significant amounts of time and energy in routine mechanical tasks and allow them to concentrate their efforts on improving, broadening, and enriching the curricula and kindling the imagination of students of all ages, from all backgrounds."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, a great deal of good has been accomplished through educational television, particularly by the universities, such as the one located in my district, the Ohio State University and also Purdue University located at West Lafayette, Ind., where they instituted the pilot program in this area. I believe all of us are in complete support of the purposes behind educational TV. However, there is a serious question relative to the creation of a public corporation and the use of public funds extracted from the taxpayer that undoubtedly will end up in direct competition with the free enterprise system represented by the networks as well as the local radio and television stations.

I would invite the attention of the Members to the separate views and the minority views that appear at the end of the report, and would say to the Members that an amendment will be offered

by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON] to strike title II from the bill. If we are not successful in that, and we feel we will be, then it will probably be part of a motion to recommit.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY].

(Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk to the Members for a few minutes, about the financing of title II under this particular legislation.

I believe that in bringing this bill before the House today that what we are doing is "putting the cart before the horse," because we are talking about a corporation, but we are not saying how we are going to finance that corporation. We are turning over a tremendous job to that corporation which is going to cost a lot of money in the future, no matter whose views you take. HEW, the Carnegie Commission, or the Ford Foundation.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. No; I cannot yield to the gentleman. I only have 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it might be helpful just to look at what a few people who know something about this particular program have had to say about it. The Carnegie Commission spent months and months studying this particular problem of public funds. The Ford Foundation spent months and months studying this problem, and I will have more to say about what both these institutions recommended about financing. I refer you to the Carnegie Commission report. This is the majority view, mind you, of the commission members on how we should go about financing this title II. They recommended that the Congress should provide Federal funds by the enactment of an excise tax varying from 2 to 5 percent on TV stations. This would be a dedicated tax, and it would go into a trust fund to pay for the provisions of title II in the program. And after saying how much it would cost in the first year, which they estimated would be in excess of \$50 million, they said this:

For these funds, within the area in which public programing is most sensitive to government involvement, the commission cannot favor the ordinary budgeting and appropriations procedure followed by the government in providing support from general funds. We believe those procedures are not consonant with the degree of independence essential to public television.

That is just exactly what is being done today by providing this money through appropriation provisions.

Let us look also for a minute at what the gentleman who filed the minority views to the Carnegie Commission report had to say, and I refer to Mr. McConnell, president of the Reynolds Co. Mr. McConnell had this to say in his report about how to finance this, and I call attention to his remarks on page 72 of the Carnegie Commission report:

I quite agree that if public television is to be financed in major part by the federal government, it would be highly desirable to avoid year-to-year appropriation by the Congress. The political implications of these are apparent. And certainly there should be complete divorce of the programing and other functions of the public corporation from the government.

So once again we have one of the experts saying that we should not do it in the fashion we are doing it.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. No; I cannot yield at this point, I am sorry.

Let us take a look at the members of the Ford Foundation. For instance, what did Mr. Bundy have to say when he came before our committee? He was asked by the ranking member on our side, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], on page 387 of the hearings, that assuming the program was going to cost \$170 million in public funds, what he thought about it. Again I quote from page 387 of the House hearings, where the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] asked:

At this time, let's assume it is going to be \$170 million of public funds. How would it remain independent?

Meaning the corporation.

Mr. Bundy said:

I think it would be difficult, and I wouldn't at this stage of the game be in favor of such a recommendation. It seems to me important to find an insulated means of providing funds. The direct appropriation process, as I understand the matter, is not in my judgment a satisfactory means of doing that.

So we have Mr. Bundy.

We also have Mr. Fred Friendly, who is another famous television personality who, together with Ed Murrow, had charge of the "See It Now" program, and many other CBS programs.

What did Mr. Friendly have to say? And I quote from page 184 of the Senate hearings.

He said:

What I certainly am saying—and I would be glad to say it a thousand times—is that I am against—and I hope we all are—Federal money from general revenues going into news and public affairs broadcasting.

That is what I mean, and that is what I am here to say. And it is part of my very being.

Fred Friendly is now a special consultant to the Ford Foundation on this particular matter.

So no matter how you conclude it, Mr. Chairman, the people who are in this particular field have all warned both sides of the aisle on this dangerous precedent that we are setting here in authorizing to be appropriated \$9 million to start this particular corporation—without doing either what the Carnegie Commission said of providing an excise tax; or without doing what the Ford Foundation said, to provide a satellite tax; or without doing what Mr. McConnell said in his minority views of taxing the television stations themselves.

We are doing it because this Congress is afraid to face up to the facts as to how we are going to pay for this program in the future.

If the President cannot get his tax bill to finance the war in Vietnam, I do not think he is going to get one through to finance this particular program and I do not think he is by any means whatsoever.

Just to conclude, on this note, if we as Congressmen are willing to appropriate money for title II in this particular program, we might just as well start appropriating money to write the textbooks in America because this is literally what we are doing—writing the textbooks for America by the money appropriated in this particular fashion.

I do not believe that many Members of the Congress, including those who are not in this Chamber right now, would think or vote for this to go through in order to go through with that.

Mr. Bundy did not—Mr. Friendly did not—the Carnegie Commission did not—and not the majority of Americans—I do not believe any thinking person in America would want to go through with the programing provided in title II as long as that financing is through the appropriation process, and subject to this political influence.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is surprising that the Carnegie Commission did not recommend a substantial license fee on commercial TV when you consider that its membership is composed of representatives of TV stations including the head of CBS.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, since the advent of commercial television, Americans have invested some \$20 billion in TV sets. They continue to purchase sets at the rate of \$2 billion annually. It would be difficult to think of a single modern invention that has had a more powerful impact upon the present generation. Someone has estimated that by high school graduation the average American youngster has consumed 15,000 hours of time simply watching television. The "Now Generation" as they are sometimes referred to is truly the product of an electronic era. Marshall McLuhan, the communications expert, who has become famous for the phrase "the medium is the message" has expressed the fears of many with this statement in his book *Explorations in Communication*:

Harnessing the Tennessee, Missouri or Mississippi is kid stuff compared with curbing the movie, press or television to human ends.

The Carnegie Corp. has sponsored the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television. The 15 members of this commission numbered some of our country's most distinguished scholars, educators, and scientists. They spent more than a year studying noncommercial television or what is also referred to as educational television. In general, this is TV programing which is not supported by ad-

vertising revenues. Today our television is predominantly commercial. There are five commercial TV stations for every existing educational station. The operating revenues of the former are approximately \$4 billion a year; whereas the educational stations in existence, about 136 in number, subsist on 3 percent of that amount.

Congress has now moved to adopt most of the recommendations of the Carnegie Commission in the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. The central conclusion of the commission's report was that a well-financed and well-directed educational television system, substantially larger and far more pervasive and effective than that which now exists should be created. To accomplish this the Federal Government will continue the program begun in 1962 of providing Federal matching grants to construct new educational TV stations.

The most salient feature of this new bill is the provision for a federally chartered corporation for public broadcasting directed by a 15-man bipartisan Board of Directors appointed by the President. This Corporation will then actually finance and produce programs of a cultural and educational nature for distribution to local stations. They will also assist local stations who wish to produce their own programs.

The law forbids financing of any programs which editorialize on political issues and defines programs permissible for this new type of Federal financing as those which are "primarily designed for educational or cultural purposes and not primarily for amusement or entertainment purposes." Other sections of the law require the total autonomy of local stations. Although the Federal Corporation can provide for a hookup between stations for telecasting the same program over a whole region or perhaps even the entire country on occasion, it is specifically prohibited from operating a Government network or owning and operating stations like the British Broadcasting Corporation. Some of the principal remaining objections to this bill lie in the fear that something like a national network under Federal sponsorship might nevertheless emerge.

Under such circumstances the danger of political manipulation of the programing or deliberate slanting of the news could create a powerful, partisan political weapon. However, proponents of the Federal Public Television Corporation insist it is designed to bring cultural uplift and educational program to a mass audience, and any such political abuses are strictly forbidden by the law itself.

The commercial networks have all endorsed the legislation. One can only hope that they do not do so secure in the knowledge that viewers will never abandon the TV westerns, situation comedies, and daytime soap operas in favor of cultural uplift and education.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 because I believe that it can help realize the vast potential of television to elevate cultural and educational standards in our country. I do not feel that commercial television is adapted for that purpose as presently constituted. While I support

the bill I hold some reservations. I believe that Congress must very closely monitor the implementation of the various provisions of this act, particularly title II. It would be foolish to deny that there are no opportunities for misuse of the programing authority confided in the Corporation.

However, I think we must have some faith in the honor, integrity, and qualifications of those who will be selected to serve on the board of directors. If Congress maintains close scrutiny and carries out its oversight function as it should, I think that the problem can be kept within manageable proportions. In short, I think that the possibility for good so far outweigh these potentially negative features that I give this legislation my support with the enthusiastic hope that the high goals set by the Carnegie Commission on public broadcasting will be fulfilled.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH].

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 6736, the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967.

No feature of our modern world is as American as television. In a period of only two decades this medium has come to bind many regions of our land more closely as people and as a nation. Yet, while television has attained a universal audience, it has not attained a universal excellence.

Newton Minow's description of television as a "wasteland" still comes too readily to mind. Television is peculiarly American and because of this we should all make an effort to see that American television is particularly excellent.

The public broadcasting bill will help to assure this excellence. But, Mr. Chairman, as I have noted in my additional views, we have to keep an eye on this creature that we have created.

Mr. Chairman, I invite the attention of the Committee to my views in the committee report which point out the fact that this could become a partisan and political tool if we are not constantly on the alert for the danger of partisanship.

Earlier today the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] mentioned that he approved of editorializing by educational TV as it is done in commercial TV. But he said he was concerned about editorializing that takes place in news columns. I am concerned about editorializing which could take place in educational TV programs. I want to be sure that the Congress has sufficient safeguards to protect the public interest against this possible threat.

In my view, the safeguards that we have put into the legislation with the bipartisan board of directors of the corporation and the prohibition against editorializing go a long ways toward this and will, hopefully, be effective.

But, there is still a doubt in my mind that upon occasion editorializing could sneak into the programing in the same way that it does in the news columns.

I recall that, several years ago, this administration contracted to have a film made of certain public works programs that were underway or nearing comple-

tion in one of the communities in my district. One of the subtle purposes of this film was, I am sure, to encourage public support of the legislation which made the programs possible. In the long run it could have affected the candidacy of those who supported or failed to support the legislation.

I did not happen to vote for that program. It is conceivable that I could be tied in with the opposition to that program through this film, and it could then have adversely affected my candidacy for re-election. This kind of film is the kind of program that we must guard against. Mr. Chairman, as this public TV becomes a reality those who operate it must come back to the Congress for funding in succeeding years. In my view Mr. Chairman the Congress has the power and the responsibility to watch out that the programs are both worth while and objective. We, through our Commerce and Appropriations Committees, and through the House as a whole, can and will exercise the necessary oversight and accordingly we should go along with the bill.

I should like to ask the chairman one question, if I may, with reference to the right of an injured party to sue the station or other organization. Let us assume, Mr. Chairman, that editorializing does occur or is thought to be present by an injured party. What recourse would he have in the courts to get compensation for the injury that might have been done to him?

Mr. STAGGERS. I would say that the man would have the same recourse that he would have in any other similar suit, such as a suit for libel, or anything of that sort.

Mr. KEITH. Who would pay for the damages?

Mr. STAGGERS. Of course, the station would have to, I assume.

Mr. KEITH. If Federal funds are contributed, would the Federal Government be liable?

Mr. STAGGERS. The gentleman is talking about instructional television stations?

Mr. KEITH. Yes; and any public TV supported by Federal funds.

Mr. STAGGERS. You are raising a question that I believe is very hypothetical. I believe that we have written enough safeguards into the bill so that that will not happen.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEITH. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I think the gentleman is making a very good point. The fact is under a recent decision of the Supreme Court, a public official is a sitting duck, and he cannot recover for libel unless he can prove malice. Those of us in public office are in a position where newspapers, radio, or TV stations can say anything they wish about us. Even if it is untrue, we cannot recover unless we can prove malice, which is practically impossible to do. Therefore, the right of editorializing should be very, very carefully scrutinized.

Mr. KEITH. I would remind my colleagues that this is an area where we

must be on the alert. I believe on balance it is a good bill, but I do believe that it requires us to be constantly on the alert.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Watson].

(Mr. WATSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say initially that those of us who will make an effort to strike title II of this bill are as strongly in favor of giving Federal help to the local ETV stations as anyone who is in favor of retaining title II. That is not our complaint at all. Frankly, I would respectfully take issue with my friend from Illinois when he said that title II is the heart of this bill. Title II is not the heart of the bill.

The heart of this bill, if we are interested in helping our local ETV stations is title I, the continuation of the program that the Congress wisely started in 1961, which has had a highly beneficial effect upon all the local ETV stations throughout the country.

In my judgment, and I think I express the sentiments of so many others on the committee, and I believe in the House, I am fearful that title II will be the Frankenstein of this particular piece of legislation. My friend from Michigan has adequately discussed the financial aspects of it, or rather the lack of adequate financing of the public corporation. We have had some say that we will pick up a lot of money from private sources, but let us be realistic about this. Is it not axiomatic that when we set up a corporation in which we have Government funds, there is the inclination, and the strong inclination, for private sources to stop giving to that corporation?

Frankly, I think they should. If we are going to have public funds in it, then I do not think we should expect private sources to supplement it. If it is going to be on the back of the taxpayers, I think they should have the responsibility for all of it. The facts prove that when Government steps in, private financing steps out. There is no question about that at all.

The second problem we have with title II, if we create this Public Broadcasting Corporation, we are going into direct competition with the local ETV systems. We have one of the finest in South Carolina, and I am proud I had a part in inaugurating it when I was in the State legislature.

But I will say we are using some Federal funds now, and using them to good advantage. But here is what is going to happen. Those private sources that have been contributing to the local ETV stations are going to say, "Wait a minute. We have to contribute to the Public Broadcasting Corporation, and it will be spread out to all the stations throughout the country." The Public Broadcasting Corporation will be going into direct competition with the local ETV stations in the matter of trying to raise funds.

Those gentlemen who support title II say, "Do not worry about control." Local stations can either take the programs given to them by the Public Corporation or not, they can accept or reject them.

Let us be practical. As a practical matter, since the local station will be getting some funds from the Public Corporation as well as programs, we can be sure the local station is going to be rather reluctant not to play those programs which are offered them by the Public Broadcasting Corporation.

Here is the hooker in it all. They say the local station can take it or not, but bear in mind that all the programs given them—unless they go out and produce their own or others—will be programs from the PBC. In other words, "You can choose from this I offer you, or from that I offer you," and so on and on. Frankly, we are not going to have adequate controls or safeguards.

There is another potential danger. This Corporation could be a propaganda monster, although we have said there shall be no editorializing. Let us be realistic. An editorial is not very persuasive or influential. Let them go ahead and editorialize. Give me the right to control program content, and others can editorialize all they want to, but I will influence the thinking of the American public more with the programs or with people I have appearing on the programs.

The American public knows editorials are subjective, but they believe regular programs are objective. So this is a very real problem we are going to have in this matter.

The committee wisely wrote in that there shall be no editorializing, and that on programs of a controversial nature there shall be balance and equal time. That does not protect us. Who determines whether or not they are objective and in balance?

Later on, we will give other reasons to the House why the House should reject this proposition. Let us give this money to the local stations who have been doing such a wonderful job in this medium of television.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

(Mr. ROBISON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support for titles I and III of H.R. 6736, but also to express my strong reservations about the provisions of title II.

I am a strong supporter of educational television, and we have long felt that its full potential has not been appreciated. We, of New York, have made substantial progress in this direction, however, moving now as we are toward a statewide educational TV network, connecting up the five ETV stations we now have on the air and those we soon hope to add—including one in my area of the State—into a network which will have the built-in potential for future interconnection with other State or regional networks.

For States such as New York, however, that have moved vigorously ahead on such programs, the limited amount of Federal assistance available under the Educational Television Act of 1962—surely a major benchmark in this field—and especially the \$1 million-per-State

cutoff point set by that act, has prevented us from moving ahead as fast and as far as we would like, even though the State itself is now contributing construction moneys.

For this reason, I introduced legislation in the last Congress to merely extend the 1962 act for another 5 years, at an additional authorization of \$32 million—the same as the original authorization—but also to increase the per-State limitation from the original \$1 to \$2 million.

When that bill failed to move, I reintroduced it in this Congress—where it is known as H.R. 4140. However, at about the same time something of considerable import happened—which was, of course, the release to the public of the long-awaited report of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television.

Now, as a result of that report, we all of a sudden found ourselves no longer just talking about educational television, a familiar concept which had already won for itself wide public and congressional acceptance and support, but about such other intriguing but possibly controversial matters as “public television” and “noncommercial television” which, though surely related to ETV, also involve difficult issues of public policy, issues that I am sure are very much in our minds at the moment.

And so it is that, in H.R. 6736 and in S. 1160 as passed by the other body, both of which, significantly, bear the title of “Public Broadcasting Act of 1967,” we find in title II a proposal, described in the Senate report as embodying:

The bold and imaginative concept of an independent, non-profit corporation to assist in developing a *vital noncommercial educational broadcasting system*—

Under which Federal funds will be used to help produce “higher quality educational programs,” the programing of which—again quoting from the Senate report—should not only be supplementary to but *competitive* with commercial broadcasting services.

Title II provides an initial authorization of Federal funds for the purposes of the Corporation in the amount of \$9 million, designed, as the Senate report says, “to get the Corporation off the ground,” but it is also admitted that this is only “seed money” and that “much more money will be required in future years if the Corporation is to accomplish the task before it,” however that task may come to be defined and, as we all know, the President has said that—

Next year, after careful review, I will make further proposals for the Corporation's long-range financing.

Mr. Chairman, I am not immune to the deficiencies of commercial television programing. As the father of two teenage sons who are inveterate watchers of this wonderful but sometimes discouraging medium and who, therefore, often expose me to more of its “wasteland” than I might otherwise venture into alone, I can well understand why the Wall Street Journal editorially referred earlier this year to that “multihued monster which transmits a gooey mixture of soap operas, quiz shows, and kiddie cartoons”

But, given the enormous appetite of this medium—which the average American supposedly watches some 6 hours a day—I wonder whether even the average quality of commercial television's output, while admittedly bad enough, is really as bad as it is sometimes contended. I also wonder if it is so bad that, without a further public dialog than that so far engendered by the Commission's report and the hearings here this year and in the body, it is either wise or necessary for us, in our eagerness for an elusive “quality” in programing, to begin to move now in the direction of setting up at least the beginnings of a competitive, federally financed, “public television”—or “noncommercial television”—system, for that is where we would seem to be going, using the accepted virtues and great potential of educational TV to do so.

Would it not be better, I ask, to submit this portion—title II—of the bill before us, or of S. 1160, to further scrutiny—perhaps by broadening the purposes of the comprehensive study of instructional television and radio authorized under title III to be made by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare?

It would seem to me so—and that this would also permit the President time to make up his mind about the best way for arranging long-range financing of the proposed Corporation, before the creation of which even with “seed money” it would seem necessary for us, in these difficult budgetary times, to have some better idea than any of us now do about how much money such a corporation can consume and where it is to come from.

Mr. Chairman, there is—as I see it—no great urgency in creating the corporate entity envisioned in title II now, despite the probable future need for some such supporting body. To the contrary, there may well be much wisdom on the side of delaying such action for, as I have said, at least 1 year.

While, therefore, I strongly support the other provisions of H.R. 6736, I do intend to support the anticipated amendment to strike title II from the bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I should like to insert at this point in the Record a description of a kind of “public television” described by the English author, George Orwell, in his masterpiece, “1984.” It follows:

The next moment a hideous, grinding screech, as of some monstrous machine running without oil, burst from the big telescreen at the end of the room. It was a noise that set one's teeth on edge and bristled the hair at the back of one's neck. The Hate had started.

As usual, the face of Emmanuel Goldstein, the Enemy of the People, had flashed onto the screen. There were hisses here and there among the audience. The little sandy-haired woman gave a squeak of mingled fear and disgust. Goldstein was the renegade and backslider who once, long ago (how long ago, nobody quite remembered), had been one of the leading figures of the Party, al-

most on a level with Big Brother himself, and then had engaged in counterrevolutionary activities, had been condemned to death, and had mysteriously escaped and disappeared. The program of the Two Minutes Hate varied from day to day, but there was none in which Goldstein was not the principal figure. He was the primal traitor, the earliest defiler of the Party's purity. All subsequent crimes against the Party, all treacheries, acts of sabotage, heresies, deviations, sprang directly out of his teaching. Somewhere or other he was still alive and hatching his conspiracies: perhaps somewhere beyond the sea, under the protection of his foreign paymasters; perhaps even—so it was occasionally rumored—in some hiding place in Oceania itself.

Winston's diaphragm was constricted. He could never see the face of Goldstein without a painful mixture of emotions. It was a lean Jewish face, with a great fuzzy aureole of white hair and a small goatee beard—a clever face, and yet somehow inherently despicable, with a kind of senile silliness in the long thin nose near the end of which a pair of spectacles was perched. It resembled the face of a sheep, and the voice, too, had a sheeplike quality. Goldstein was delivering his usual venomous attack upon the doctrines of the Party—an attack so exaggerated and perverse that a child should have been able to see through it, and yet just plausible enough to fill one with an alarmed feeling that other people, less level-headed than oneself, might be taken in by it. He was abusing Big Brother, he was denouncing the dictatorship of the Party, he was demanding the immediate conclusion of peace with Eurasia, he was advocating freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of thought, he was crying hysterically that the revolution had been betrayed—and all this in rapid polysyllabic speech which was a sort of parody of the habitual style of the orators of the Party, and even contained Newspeak words: more Newspeak words, indeed, than any Party member would normally use in real life. And all the while, lest one should be in any doubt as to the reality which Goldstein's specious claptrap covered, behind his head on the telescreen there marched the endless columns of the Eurasian army—row after row of solid-looking men with expressionless Asiatic faces, who swam up to the surface of the screen and vanished, to be replaced by others exactly similar. The dull, rhythmic tramp of the soldiers' boots formed the background to Goldstein's bleating voice.

Before the Hate had proceeded for thirty seconds, uncontrollable exclamations of rage were breaking out from half the people in the room. The self-satisfied sheeplike face on the screen, and the terrifying power of the Eurasian army behind it, were too much to be borne; besides, the sight or even the thought of Goldstein produced fear and anger automatically. He was an object of hatred more constant than either Eurasia or Eastasia, since when Oceania was at war with one of these powers it was generally at peace with the other. But what was strange was that although Goldstein was hated and despised by everybody, although every day, and a thousand times a day, on platforms, on the telescreen, in newspapers, in books, his theories were refuted, smashed, ridiculed, held up to the general gaze for the pitiful rubbish that they were—in spite of all this, his influence never seemed to grow less. Always there were fresh dupes waiting to be seduced by him. A day never passed when spies and saboteurs acting under his directions were not unmasked by the Thought Police. He was the commander of a vast shadowy army, an underground network of conspirators dedicated to the overthrow of the State. The Brotherhood, its name was supposed to be. There were also whispered stories of a terrible book, a compendium of all the heresies, of which Goldstein was the

author and which circulated clandestinely here and there. It was a book without a title. People referred to it, if at all, simply as *the book*. But one knew of such things only through vague rumors. Neither the Brotherhood nor *the book* was a subject that any ordinary Party member would mention if there was a way of avoiding it.

In its second minute the Hate rose to a frenzy. People were leaping up and down in their places and shouting at the tops of their voices in an effort to drown the maddening bleating voice that came from the screen. The little sandy-haired woman had turned bright pink, and her mouth was opening and shutting like that of a landed fish. Even O'Brien's heavy face was flushed. He was sitting very straight in his chair, his powerful chest swelling and quivering as though he were standing up to the assault of a wave. The dark-haired girl behind Winston had begun crying out "Swine! Swine! Swine!" and suddenly she picked up a heavy Newspeak dictionary and flung it at the screen. It struck Goldstein's nose and bounced off; the voice continued inexorably. In a lucid moment Winston found that he was shouting with the others and kicking his heel violently against the rung of his chair. The horrible thing about the Two Minutes Hate was not that one was obliged to act a part, but that it was impossible to avoid joining in. Within thirty seconds any pretence was always unnecessary. A hideous ecstasy of fear and vindictiveness, a desire to kill, to torture, to smash faces in with a sledge hammer, seemed to flow through the whole group of people like an electric current, turning one even against one's will into a grimacing, screaming lunatic. And yet the rage that one felt was an abstract, undirected emotion which could be switched from one object to another like the flame of a blowlamp. Thus, at one moment Winston's hatred was not turned against Goldstein at all, but, on the contrary, against Big Brother, the Party, and the Thought Police; and at such moments his heart went out to the lonely, derided heretic on the screen, sole guardian of truth and sanity in a world of lies. And yet the very next instant he was at one with the people about him, and all that was said of Goldstein seemed to him to be true. At those moments his secret loathing of Big Brother changed into adoration, and Big Brother seemed to tower up, an invincible, fearless protector, standing like a rock against the hordes of Asia, and Goldstein, in spite of his isolation, his helplessness, and the doubt that hung about his very existence, seemed like some sinister enchanter, capable by the mere power of his voice of wrecking the structure of civilization.

The Hate rose to its climax. The voice of Goldstein had become an actual sheep's bleat, and for an instant the face changed into that of a sheep. Then the sheep-face melted into the figure of a Eurasian soldier who seemed to be advancing, huge and terrible, his submachine gun roaring and seeming to spring out of the surface of the screen, so that some of the people in the front row actually flinched backwards in their seats. But in the same moment, drawing a deep sigh of relief from everybody, the hostile figure melted into the face of Big Brother, black-haired, black-mustachio'd, full of power and mysterious calm, and so vast that it almost filled up the screen. Nobody heard what Big Brother was saying. It was merely a few words of encouragement, the sort of words that are uttered in the din of battle, not distinguishable individually but restoring confidence by the fact of being spoken. Then the face of Big Brother faded away again, and instead the three slogans of the Party stood out in bold capitals: war is peace, freedom is slavery, ignorance is strength.

But the face of Big Brother seemed to persist for several seconds on the screen, as though the impact that it had made on everyone's eyeballs were too vivid to wear off immediately. The little sandy-haired woman had flung herself forward over the back of the chair in front of her. With a tremulous murmur that sounded like "My Savior!" she extended her arms toward the screen. Then she buried her face in her hands. It was apparent that she was uttering a prayer.

At this moment the entire group of people broke into a deep, slow, rhythmical chant of "B-B! . . . B-B! . . . B-B!" over and over again, very slowly, with a long pause between the first "B" and the second—a heavy, murmurous sound, somehow curiously savage, in the background of which one seemed to hear the stamp of naked feet and the throbbing of tom-toms. For perhaps as much as thirty seconds they kept it up. It was a refrain that was often heard in moments of overwhelming emotion. Partly it was a sort of hymn to the wisdom and majesty of Big Brother, but still more it was an act of self-hypnosis, a deliberate drowning of consciousness by means of rhythmic noise. Winston's entrails seemed to grow cold. In the Two Minutes Hate he could not help sharing in the general delirium, but this subhuman chanting of "B-B! . . . B-B!" always filled him with horror. Of course he chanted with the rest: it was impossible to do otherwise. To dissemble your feelings, to control your face, to do what everyone else was doing, was an instinctive reaction.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

(Mr. HALPERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my strong support for the passage of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. The people of this country deserve the chance to discover and the opportunity to learn which educational television can provide. That is why I have long advocated legislation of this kind and why I am pleased to be associated as a sponsor of the bill before us.

Those of us who live in areas already serviced by noncommercial television may tend to forget that many of our citizens still do not share in our good fortune. Although 102 new educational television stations have been built or are now under construction since the passage of the Educational Television Facilities Act of 1962, one quarter of the Nation's population is not yet being reached. Title I of this bill, by promoting the construction of new local stations and the expansion of existing facilities, will bring us closer to the time when all of our citizens will be able to take advantage of the opportunities provided by educational television and radio. It could help them to become well-informed citizens capable of meaningful participation in the modern world.

Educational television has already provided us with many fine examples of its potential for excellence. It has also, however, succeeded in whetting the public's appetite for more. Quality programming is an expensive investment, but the returns in increased national awareness of the problems and opportunities in our rapidly changing world will be more

than commensurate with the cost. The encouragement and support of the Public Broadcasting Corporation will enable educational television to produce the imaginative and stimulating programs of which it is capable.

The employment of new talent and the opportunity to explore new ideas unhampered by the limitations inherent in commercial broadcasting, will benefit the radio and television industry as a whole. Furthermore, it will provide each individual with a chance to develop new interests and skills. The flexibility granted to the Public Broadcasting Corporation will allow it to serve both local and national interests effectively; its presence will guarantee educational television of freedom from either Government interference or control, as well as providing this new media with the direction and perspective necessary to utilize its funds more efficiently.

While noncommercial public broadcasting has been expanding and developing before our very eyes, great changes have also been taking place in the Nation's schools. Instructional television is entering more and more of our children's classrooms. The results have been so encouraging and expansion therefore so rapid, that there has been little time to step back and assess both the possibilities and limitations of this new teaching device. Title III will provide the authorization for just such a comprehensive study. Instructional television has already proven itself to be a valuable tool in the education of our children; the study to be conducted by Health, Education, and Welfare will provide us with the information necessary to utilize this tool most effectively for the benefit of all our students.

I should like to stress the immediate need for passage of this bill in its entirety. Educational technology advances more rapidly each day; it is our responsibility to insure that the maximum number of citizens are given the opportunity to share in the benefits made possible by these advances. I urge my fellow Representatives to accord to educational television the additional public support and encouragement it so richly deserves.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BROTZMAN].

(Mr. BROTZMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 6736. I believe it goes a long way toward establishing the principle that substantial Federal support—with guarantees against oppressive Government control—is in the best interest of public broadcasting and the Nation.

While the field of educational and instructional radio and television has made enormous strides in the past decade, the potential of these media for improving the quality of life in our Nation has scarcely been touched.

The basic provisions of this bill have been described today at length, but I would like to add some personal obser-

ventions which I made during the pertinent hearings and discussions of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Title I of the bill will provide for the extension and continuation of the program of grant assistance in the acquisition and installation of equipment for noncommercial educational television broadcasting facilities. And, for the first time, it will extend this assistance to educational radio broadcasters.

We were successful in adding an amendment to title I which, I believe, overcomes a weakness evident in the original bill. This amendment will limit the amount of funds available to any one State to 8½ percent of the total authorization, which will insure wider use of the funds and encourage more States to participate.

The most innovative features of the bill are, in my opinion, contained in title II, which calls for establishment of a nonprofit non-Government private corporation to bring to bear not only programming expertise but also a new level of facility and fiscal support for educational broadcasting. The Corporation for Public Broadcasting, as it is called, will act as a central depository for both public and private funds pledged to support educational broadcasting. The corporation will not, in itself, own or operate any broadcast outlets.

The fear of Government control of programming was recurrent during consideration of this bill by my committee. In my mind it was and is a justifiable fear. However, Mr. Chairman, I believe we were successful in adding amendments which—along with a reasonable degree of vigilance on the part of Congress—will prevent this corporation from becoming a Government propaganda tool.

For example, one amendment provides that not more than eight of the 15 directors of the Corporation can be members of the same political party. Another amendment prohibits editorializing and endorsement of political candidates by noncommercial stations.

Title III of the bill calls for a comprehensive study of educational and instructional television broadcasting by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with a monetary authorization of \$500,000. The study will look into existing programming on educational television, financial factors relevant to television's use in schools, and assessment of television as an instructional medium compared to other media.

The study will be completed by January 1, 1969. This is none too soon, because data of this type is sorely needed even now for our use in correcting a basic weakness which remains in the bill—the lack of a long-range fiscal policy.

The question of financing the Corporation occupied a great deal of time during the committee consideration of this bill.

Several sources of funding were considered, ranging from conventional appropriations to levying of an excise tax on television sets. As pointed out in the separate views, which I signed, one factor behind this still unresolved quandary was

the fact the President has failed to give so much as a hint as to his intentions about the manner in which Federal funds would be made available to the Corporation.

Personally, I would have preferred that the private sector fund the Corporation 100 percent, but realistically such sources would probably be inadequate. The testimony before our committee indicated that \$30 million—at most—might be available from foundations and private donations. This simply would not be sufficient to meet the estimated annual need.

The committee has recommended that \$9 million in Federal funds be provided to augment private-sector moneys in establishing and operating the Corporation the first year. The long-range financing policies must be agreed upon within that time, I believe, and, with the full cooperation of HEW, the Corporation, and the administration. I am confident that Congress can settle this one major piece of unfinished business inherent in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, even as it stands, this legislation will give us a sound foundation upon which to build. I therefore urge its passage.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MACDONALD].

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I should like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON] if he were present at the hearing at the time when Mr. Thomas F. Jones, chairman of the Committee on Educational Telecommunications, of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, who is from South Carolina, testified? Is it not a fact that he endorsed this program completely, with no reservations, and said all the testimony he had heard about it would help the area that was served by his facility in South Carolina?

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. WATSON. I well know Dr. Jones, the outstanding president of the University of South Carolina. I well know further that one of the principal ways used to sell this entire program to the local ETV stations was telling them the only way they would get the money under title I was to buy the entire package, including title II.

I might say further in response to the gentleman, this is from a letter written by the head of ETV in South Carolina, Dr. Cauthen, to Dr. Killian. He said that the Public Broadcasting Corporation was going to deal primarily in cultural aspects.

He stated:

We agree that there is a place for the cultural offerings, such as symphonies, ballets, etc., so generously offered now through ETV, but we are far more impressed with the fact that 150,000 South Carolina school children and 100,000 adults are enrolled this year in courses of instruction in South Carolina.

That is what I am interested in, the bread and butter of instructional and educational TV, and not the frills.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. I yield no further.

I ask a second question. Are you disavowing the testimony on page 757 of our hearings, in which the representative from South Carolina endorsed this bill wholeheartedly? Are you disavowing him?

Mr. WATSON. I am only saying, if the gentleman will yield—

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. I know you have disavowed other things other times, but I ask you, are you now disavowing him?

Mr. WATSON. Since the gentleman accuses me of disavowing things at other times, if he would be fair to the Committee—forget about being fair to me—he should tell us wherein these other instances have occurred. Otherwise, I can only assume the question of the gentleman is not a serious one and deserves no reply from me.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. I would ask for a reply from you, because you state that you represent the position taken by your State. I just know that the people who came from your State to testify before us were in favor of this program.

I ask, do you not agree with the people who testified before our committee?

Mr. WATSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. WATSON. As I stated earlier, I will give the gentleman a direct response. One of the principal ways the administration has sold this program is to tell the local ETV authorities, "If you want title I money then you have to buy the whole bill, including title II, the Public Broadcasting Corporation."

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. That is not really an answer to the question.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to a couple of points that were just raised in the colloquy on the floor. I would like to have the attention of the gentlemen who have just been speaking on this program and who said that title II should be stricken from the bill because it does this or that or that we are afraid of something it might do. I would say that you just do not have the confidence in the members of the committee that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] and I have. We will take a look at this a year from now and decide what will be done. Somebody else will not tell us what to do at that time. The members of the committee who are then sitting will make the decisions. We will all be back here next year unless death occurs or something else happens. You say something might happen. You should have enough respect for the intelligence and the integrity of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to understand that it will do what is right for the

country when the time comes to do it. We have not made a decision on it yet. We have spent \$32 million already on broadcast equipment and the bill provides another \$38 million on equipment. We need something to put this equipment into operation—programs of high quality. Without Government assistance the meager resources of local stations are not adequate to provide such programs.

The gentleman from South Carolina says that local stations are doing a good job in their localities in that State. I agree with him. But we do not want to be provincial in this country. We want this land to be connected, to be interconnected, and we want to know what is going on in other sections of the country. We want to make the best use of it that is possible. You may have the best system in South Carolina. We would like to share it with you. That is all we are trying to do. You have no way of providing a connection or an interconnection. You say that we should have each community control its own. We want it to go throughout the country.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I would like to yield, but I just do not have any more time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 6736. I would like to thank the distinguished chairman and the members of the committee for letting me testify in behalf of this bill during the public hearings. In my State we enacted the Educational Television Act in 1966, which placed educational TV under the control of the State. There is no question in my mind after a few years of classroom and adult educational TV that this will be one of the biggest boosts for the purpose of upgrading education in my State. The largest single grant under the facilities section of the act went to the State of Mississippi, as the gentleman from Illinois earlier mentioned. We received \$777,000 to purchase cameras and equipment to put educational TV on the air. If we had not received this grant, I sincerely believe we would have lost our educational television VHF channel. There were some commercial enterprises that were very much interested in trying to get this VHF channel. They wanted to take it away from educational TV. This grant helped us to keep the channel. In my State I would say 95 percent of the homes in my State have electricity and lights. About 91 percent of the people who have lights in my State have a TV set. This is certainly going to mean a lot to our people if they can get educational television coming in on their television sets. We are excited in my State on the future of educational television.

I would like to quote from Mr. William R. Smith, director, Mississippi Authority for Educational Television, on page 12 of this report, who stated before this committee on open hearings:

Much of what we have accomplished has been assisted and stimulated by Federal funding through the Educational Television Facilities Act, and we look forward to future financial assistance. Mississippi is not a wealthy State. There are a dozen different needs for every available dollar, but few

needs more worthy, few so necessary as the development and stimulation of an eager mind.

Thus, we are committed to educational television.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side of the aisle to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KUYKENDALL].

(Mr. KUYKENDALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 6736. I am proud of the thorough job our committee did in preparing this bill. We held lengthy and comprehensive hearings and, in executive session, went over the bill with great care to make sure that it would accomplish its purposes and to remove as far as possible dangers of abuses. The result, I believe, is a good bill, a bill which every Member of this body can support knowing that in its application we will be making a notable contribution to improving the education of those who are presently educationally deprived.

Educational TV has already chalked up an enviable record of achievement in meeting the educational needs from the illiterate all the way up to teaching highly sophisticated scientific groups. It meets the need where the need is greatest in rural areas and educationally deprived areas where standard school systems and teaching methods have been unable to make the desired impact.

There are those who will say that we may be creating a monster in setting up this type of program with Federal participation. I say to you, my colleagues, that we will create a monster only if we fail in our responsibility to keep it from becoming a monster. Any program which Congress approves can develop into a monster if we allow it to become one. The committee has made every effort in this bill to put in safeguards so that Congress will be in control. We have limited appropriations to 1 year so that we will have the opportunity to review what progress has been made and to approve future budget requests.

If, when demands are made for additional money next year, a comprehensive workable program is not presented, then I would be among the first to refuse further authorizations. Provision is made in the bill, under title II, for constant review by Congress of the activities of the corporation and the conduct of the program.

For those who say that illiteracy in the United States is a small percent of our educational problem, it is still a problem. These who are ill-fed in this country represent only a small percent of our population, but hunger is a national problem. Only a small percentage of Americans have participated in riots, but certainly riots are a national problem. So, as long as there is any illiteracy among our people, then we must treat it as a national problem and take whatever reasonable steps we can to alleviate it.

This is a good bill with a good purpose and it deserves your support.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending legislation, H.R. 6736.

In the State of West Virginia, we have been engaged in educational broadcasting for the past 3 years, under the aegis of the West Virginia Educational Broadcasting Authority. An educational television transmitter near Morgantown, W. Va., which will serve some 15 counties in the vicinity of West Virginia University, will be completed this fall. Also, Marshall University in Huntington, W. Va., and the school system of three counties are joining in an educational television project to serve southwestern West Virginia.

One of the important aspects of this development is the strong support which this project development has received from the commercial broadcasters and telecasters.

Mr. Chairman, recently the Governor of West Virginia, the Honorable Hulett C. Smith, testified before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He stated during his testimony:

I feel that Federal support for instructional television—that is, for credit instruction at the college level, as is in this case, are for other levels of education as well—is badly needed to supplement the efforts of the States.

Harry Brawley, executive secretary of the West Virginia Educational Broadcasting Authority, also testified before the committee, and characterized the pending legislation as "a bold step forward." Mr. Brawley added:

Thanks to the existence of funds for Federal aid under the ETV Facilities Program, we have begun to make great strides during the fiscal year just passed.

One of the more striking and innovative features of this legislative proposal, one which has caught the imagination of both the public and the press, is the provision for a Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

This Corporation, if enacted, will provide leadership for a national effort to upgrade the influential noncommercial television and radio media in this country. For example, one of the duties of the Corporation will be to distribute high-quality educational programs to local public television stations. Local stations will be free to accept or reject these programs, thus maintaining local autonomy and retaining program decisionmaking on the local level. At the same time, it will expand the capacity of noncommercial stations to provide, more consistently than their limited resources now allow, challenging and meaningful programming.

How will local stations benefit from the organization of this Corporation?

First, let me explain that educational television stations are in need of additional programs to achieve the potential of the media. This potential has never fully reached the promise foreseen in 1952 when the Federal Communications Commission set aside 242 station channels for the exclusive use of noncommercial educational television.

Many stations today are understaffed. Being noncommercial, they lack additional outside revenues to obtain programs. In other cases, high quality programs are simply not available. Educational stations, operating under these limitations, have tended to be stepchildren of the total broadcasting industry rather than a force by which millions of people in this country would be able to receive continual upgrading through informational and educational programs.

As President Johnson pointed out earlier this year in his message on education and health:

Non-commercial television today is reaching only a fraction of its audience and achieving only a fraction of its potential worth.

We propose to remedy this situation.

The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 will build on the experience of the existing Educational Television Facilities Act, now Public Law 87-447. Through the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, America's network of noncommercial stations will receive new impetus and begin to fulfill the vast potential of this valuable medium.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON].

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman very much for yielding to me. I would like to take this opportunity to commend the chairman, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS], and to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] for the wonderful work they have done, and also the whole committee, in this particular piece of legislation. It happens that we have a difference of opinion, primarily over title II, but I can certainly say that the chairman has been most cooperative in giving us every opportunity to voice our objections.

Mr. Chairman, again I thank the chairman of our committee for yielding.

Mr. STAGGERS. I would like to add that as the gentleman said, it was just a difference in philosophy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE].

(Mr. PICKLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill which is before us today. I simply wish to say that this bill merely extends the 1962 Education Television Facility Act and broadens it to the extent that it allows in title II a provision which provides for adequate programming.

Mr. Chairman, the 1962 act has worked well. We have heard no criticism in this House today on the desirability of or the quality of the work of this particular program. Surely we ought to expand it and extend its intent and purpose.

I very much agree with what the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], have said in general about the program. And the gentleman who spoke just a few minutes ago, the gentleman from Ten-

nessee [Mr. KUYKENDALL], I believe put his finger on a very important fact that this is a very worthwhile program and that the test is going to be if, in the creation of programs under title II, the corporation can administer the program well. I have confidence that they can do it, and that the measure is written in a manner that will allow them to administer the program correctly and properly. Surely \$20 million is not too much to give to a 1-year trial. I certainly believe the House should support this measure.

The development to date of educational television and educational radio can only be described as somewhat disappointing. Good, perhaps; but not enough.

There was high promise for the spread of culture and learning throughout our Nation when we entered what we now call the electronic age. But these media have failed to meet that full promise.

In television, chronic underfinancing has made educational television the stepchild of an explosively growing industry. We need, therefore, to up date, and attempt to make current, the great potential this media offers for the public good.

Private television has had of necessity to provide first for its own survival in the marketplace. It is now clear that there must be new encouragement of educational television and radio if these media are to approach our national needs. And it is also clear that this encouragement should come largely from the Federal Government which is the trustee of the public in the use of television channels and radio frequencies.

I am convinced that the bill now under consideration, Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, will be a major factor in providing new vigor for educational programming on radio and television.

The bill would for the first time make educational radio stations eligible to receive Federal matching grants now available in television for construction and expansion of facilities. This provision should go far toward providing the new educational radio stations that are needed to provide adequate service to the Nation.

But the provision of facilities in both radio and television is but a first step. We also must insure that proper quality of programming is developed and maintained.

This bill would establish a most hopeful and innovative means of upgrading and expanding educational television programming. I refer to the establishment of a Corporation for Public Broadcasting which will be charged with establishing a mechanism for the encouragement of new efforts to provide programs of high cultural and educational quality. Very wisely, every effort is being made to keep the corporation free of political and governmental controls and they should properly stay in their educational field—I think they will.

And, finally, the bill authorizes a study of the needs of instructional programming.

Mr. Chairman, I feel the measures I have outlined will bring about a new blossoming of public and educational television and radio. I therefore urge all my colleagues to join me in support of

this bill. We have a most outstanding ETV station in my district—KLRN-TV—which serves both Austin and San Antonio, Tex. The station is an adjunct of the University of Texas—just as similar stations serve university and college communities across our land. KLRN-TV is considered one of the best educational stations in America. The station works closely with all the regular TV and radio stations in this vast area. I believe every station supports this bill, certainly the objectives of this bill. I think it is commendable that the commercial stations and networks have endorsed this measure. We have only commenced to tap the full potential of this great television and radio media. This bill is needed to improve public educational facilities and programs.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 6736, the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. The bill before us amends the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving existing provisions for educational television broadcasting facilities, and creates grants to be made available for acquisition and/or installation of equipment for educational radio facilities.

To date the Congress has provided \$32 million for facilities needed by local stations to begin or continue educational TV broadcasting. We now seek to improve the quality and quantity of local programs.

To this end, the bill before us authorizes the creation of a nonprofit, federally chartered corporation, but with safeguards against any Federal control. In committee I was of the opinion that operational experience was necessary before we could determine future needs of the corporation. Therefore, I offered an amendment that would restrict the life of the corporation to 1 year, ending June 30, 1968. This amendment was adopted by the committee along with the provision that \$9 million be authorized for use by the corporation in providing program assistance to local stations. The original bill provided for unlimited authorization beyond June 30, 1968.

The \$9 million is to be used by the corporation with the provision that local stations have full freedom to accept or reject any programs offered by the corporation. Moreover, the corporation cannot own or operate any station, system, network or production facility.

The board of directors of this corporation are not Federal employees. The 15-member board will consist of eminent educators, cultural and civic leaders, and prominent persons from the commercial television industry.

Indeed, the communication industry of this Nation supports this bill. The major networks such as the Columbia Broadcasting Co., the National Broadcasting Co., and the American Broadcasting Co., do not regard educational

television as a competitor. ETV will be able to do those things which the major networks cannot do in quantity or quality. However, I do want to reserve judgment on how the competition with local stations will work out. For this reason we have made title II of the bill effective for 1 year.

Specifically, this bill will allow local communities to adequately serve the educational needs of their citizens where otherwise they would be unable to do so because expensive and complex technology makes quality programs beyond their reach.

Thus, in operation, this bill will preserve the local interest and integrity of an educational station, and at the same time make available to local stations, at their option, better quality programs which they might not otherwise be able to produce.

This bill seeks to improve existing law by offering Federal matching funds to noncommercial educational broadcasting facilities on terms which enable the local stations to make the final determination.

Ours is a nation committed to education. Recall the words of Thomas Jefferson in 1786:

The most important bill is that for the diffusion of knowledge among the people. No other sure foundation can be devised for the preservation of freedom and happiness.

This bill before us follows that commitment and I encourage its passage.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, in closing I would like to say this: that title II gives this legislation real meaning. We have spent money on facilities to help bring these good things to the citizens of America. Title II gives us the program material without which these costly facilities would stand idle.

Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on this side, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. This measure both recognizes the need for and potential of educational noncommercial broadcasting, and represents a strong step forward in making the benefits of such broadcasting widely available.

The potential of broadcast media as an educational tool is almost unlimited. Unfortunately, to date, only a small portion of that potential has been realized. The educational noncommercial television and radio stations of this country have at their disposal less than one-fortieth the funds available to commercial stations. In this respect we compare most unfavorably with many other nations. Private and local organizations, groups and foundations have not been lax in their generosity to these stations. The sad fact remains that local sources alone cannot meet all the burdens that are imposed on them in the effort to develop first class educational broadcast facilities and programming.

The high level of program quality that has been achieved by educational broadcasting, at such modest cost, supports the proposal to make Federal financial assistance available all across the Nation. With such assistance, educational broadcasting can become a fully effective

major instrument of education and information. A long and proud tradition of support for education as a value in itself is furthered in this bill.

The most imaginative and far-reaching provision of the Public Broadcasting Act is the establishment of a non-profit educational broadcasting corporation. This corporation, whose members are to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, will be able to initiate program-development projects, develop interconnection facilities and will be responsible for the allocation of funds to those stations deemed eligible for support. The corporation will also be responsible for facilitating the availability of programs by the creation of a library and archives of noncommercial educational television and radio programs. By this means alone the broadcast scope of each station will be greatly increased.

Protection from political or editorial bias is established in the provision that prohibit is editorializing and the support of candidates. A further check upon the latitude of the corporation is contained in the provision that no more than eight of the 15-member committee may be from one political party.

H.R. 6736, the bill which we are considering today, plays a most vital function in furthering the educational contribution of television and radio. As a cosponsor of this measure, I am pleased to commend it to your favorable consideration.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 6736, the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. In my judgment, this legislation, as amended by the committee, is an important start toward making the best America has to offer in educational and overall intellectual stimulation available to every American home.

The Public Broadcasting Act would extend and expand the current program of Federal grants for the construction of educational television facilities and would make possible—for the first time—such grants to noncommercial radio. It would also authorize a study of instructional television in the classroom and its relationship to educational television for the public.

The most significant section of the bill would provide funds for the establishment of a nonprofit corporation for public television that would encourage and facilitate the expansion and development of noncommercial broadcasting.

The major networks have indicated their support for a nationwide educational television system which would supplement and strengthen the programming provided by the 124 existing noncommercial stations—as well as new ones—and expand their coverage to reach the one-third of our population now beyond the range of educational television. Frank Stanton, president of CBS, stated in his testimony before the committee that the corporation represents “a realistic, workable approach to the difficult but challenging problem of making the most of educational broadcasting.” Leonard Goldenson, president of ABC, noted that his network “has

always approved and publicly favored the establishment of a strong and vibrant non-commercial educational television system, national in scope.”

The Carnegie Corp. study of public television first recommended the establishment of a nonprofit corporation for public television and forms the basis for this legislation. Both the Carnegie Corp. and the Ford Foundation, as well as other groups, have suggested various methods for the permanent financing of the system, after the initial Federal grant for the first year. I believe that this first year should be a time of thoughtful study to formulate the most equitable and meaningful financial and interconnection arrangements so that the promising experiment on which we hopefully will embark today will realize its full potential.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, while we are discussing this bill on public broadcasting, H.R. 6736, I would like to call the attention of the House to the educational television station which serves this area, and serves the Congress during the time it is in session.

That station is WETA, channel 26. In just a few days, on October 2, channel 26 will celebrate its sixth anniversary. Throughout its existence channel 26 has had strong connections with the 10th District of Virginia. More than 6,000 families in northern Virginia have made voluntary contributions of money to keep this station strong and active. All of the major school systems in the 10th District participate actively in the planning and production of classroom programs. Each year more than 140,000 northern Virginia schoolchildren receive part of their education from channel 26.

Indeed, the station originated in Virginia. Its first studios were in Yorktown High School, in Arlington, with its transmitter and tower located nearby. Of course, the station serves a wide area. I have given statistics which involve my district, but I know that my colleagues in other nearby districts could cite similar figures.

This station represents the best tradition of Americans getting on with a worthwhile job using their own initiative and their own money. The citizens of my district have shown with their dollars and their interest that they want this kind of television.

I would like to point out to the House that last January all the television networks carried the President's state of the Union speech. But only WETA and other stations affiliated with the National Educational Television network carried the Republican press conference which followed it. This is just an example. WETA has carried numerous programs on both sides of major issues, and millions of Americans recognize this sort of programming is a genuine and vital public service.

WETA, channel 26, has originated many of the programs which deal with subjects relating to the Congress and the people. The bill before this House can mean more and better programs on vital issues, not only for the audience in this

area, but for interested citizens across the Nation.

I would urge the Members to use what they see on channel 26 as an example, and support this bill for public television.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Chairman, legislation passed by the Congress in 1962 to aid noncommercial educational broadcasting brought, at a very small cost, a gratifying expansion in the number of educational television stations. In 5 short years the number of stations expanded from 80 to 189 in service or under construction. Audience coverage is now 155 million Americans. The Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 will continue this advance and bring the benefits of educational television to sparsely populated areas not now receiving these benefits. Alaska, as the committee report indicates, is one of the States which has no educational television stations operating or under construction. Some of the new stations financed under this act will undoubtedly be built in such areas.

The act is important for another reason, however. It establishes a corporation for public broadcasting which has the responsibility of providing Federal funds for educational programming. It is important to note that Congress intends that these funds are to be used without opening the door to Federal control. These funds should bring a rapid expansion in educational programming and with it a wider bill of fare for American TV viewers.

The corporation is further authorized to make grants for the establishment of an interconnection system between stations. Such a system would bring live educational television into areas now too remote for such service. This is of particular importance to a State such as mine. Alaska now has no live television service of any kind, educational or commercial. Our native villages have no television at all, and indeed some have no schools. What a tremendous thing educational TV could be for these people. All of the magnificent educational resources of the Nation could be brought into the homes of these villages. Instead of inferior training, they could have the best and at a relatively small cost. I am certain that other areas of the country will benefit in a similar way.

I urge the passage of H.R. 6736. Few measures that have been presented to the House will return as much benefit in relation to cost as this one.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I most earnestly urge and hope that the House will overwhelmingly approve the bill now before us—H.R. 6736—the so-called Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, because its objectives are so obviously and unquestionably in the public interest.

H.R. 6736 is designed to extend and expand the original legislation, which I supported and which was approved in this House on March 7, 1962, that established a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television facilities to be used for educational purposes.

This current measure we are now considering has three basic purposes. First, to continue the program initiated under Public Law 87-447—the Facilities Act of

1962—whereby Federal matching funds are provided to help pay for noncommercial educational television broadcasting facilities and to extend it to noncommercial radio broadcast facilities; second, to provide funds, through a non-profit private corporation, for cultural and educational programs of the highest quality so that the facilities provided under the bill can be productively utilized; and third, to provide for a study of instructional television.

In substance, this measure is offered to implement and carry out, in concrete terms, the general conclusion of the Carnegie Commission on Educational Television that has gained widespread public endorsement; namely, that this country should have a "well-financed, well-directed educational television system substantially larger and more pervasive and effective than that which now exists."

Mr. Chairman, the recommendation outlined above is principally fulfilled in title II of the measure before us which provides that a nonprofit corporation, free of political or governmental control, be established to help develop and disseminate educational and cultural programs of high quality. There are ample safeguards in the measure to assure that such corporation will be free to act independently of any attempted political pressure and that there would be no danger of Government control of programming.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that few, if any at all, will question the practical wisdom and value and essential need of accelerating our pursuit and utilization of the potential of radio and television as media for the cultural progress and educational enrichment of the people of this Nation, now or in the future. A great forward step toward the realization of this objective is contained in the provisions of title I of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, may I further say that at this time, particularly, when education in this country faces serious challenges, when the need is imperative for additional physical facilities and teachers for proper instruction of the increasing numbers of students, when subjects must be taught which only relatively few instructors are qualified and prepared to teach adequately, it seems unthinkable that this great promising medium of instruction through television should not be fully explored for utilization as a modern and progressive teaching instrument.

We have, also, the authoritative convictions and testimony of the most highly regarded experts in this field that instruction by educational television promises to be greatly superior to conventional methods of classroom teaching in a number of subjects, particularly in science studies involving technical demonstrations for better understanding.

All of this necessary study and research of television for instructive teaching will be provided for under title III of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this country is now well into the second half of the 20th century, which is, truly, a vastly more complicated, diversified and specialized age than any we have hitherto known and

no one can foretell what lies beyond the horizon.

However, we do know that extensive and complex technology is outstripping the ability of local communities to adequately serve the educational needs of our citizens and particularly the youth of our land. From the testimony and evidence that has been revealed here today, it is quite clear that the economic realities of commercial broadcasting do not permit widespread commercial production and distribution of educational and cultural programs which have, only, a selective audience appeal.

I think it is obvious, then Mr. Chairman, that there is urgent need for this legislation, in the public interest, and I again urge its swift and overwhelming approval.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 6736, the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. The major feature of this legislation is the creation of a nonprofit independent Corporation for Public Broadcasting. It will provide much-needed support for noncommercial, educational programming.

The United States has the most advanced and extensive commercial television and radio facilities in the world. But our efforts in the field of educational broadcasting have been woefully inadequate. Some of our major cities have been able to support an educational station, and some of our more affluent colleges and universities operate them but, by and large, the United States has not begun to explore this field so rich in potentialities.

For example, we have made little or no attempt to use educational television as a tool for reaching the children in our ghetto schools. The effectiveness of programs like "Sunrise Semester" have demonstrated the possibilities for teaching many different subjects on television, and educational television is a natural medium for learning the vocabulary and proper pronunciation of a foreign language.

In a perceptive article on the need for public educational broadcasting, Lester Markel, of the New York Times, focused on why commercial broadcasting has been unable to meet all our needs. Markel noted that:

The news broadcasts comprise, for the most part, a headline service, often they supply drama, but they lack depth. The cultural contributions are sporadic, even though at times they are of high order. But the most telling count in the indictment is that of timing; the evening, the important hours, for the most part, add up to a desert area with few oases.

In all three areas—information, culture and program time—Public Television can fill the gaps.

The bill before us today provides a sound mechanism for channeling funds—public, charitable, and commercial—into the field of educational broadcasting. The public corporation can make grants to local educational stations so that they can either produce their own programs or acquire them, to production entities which will supply programs to local educational facilities, and for widespread distribution of educational programs.

Many details remain to be worked out. Most important of these is the absence of any permanent financial arrangements for the funding of the Corporation. The formulation of such policy will be the most difficult and significant problem facing the Corporation in its first year. One major service of funds which should be given careful consideration would be those commercial stations that now enjoy, without fee, the privilege of extraordinarily valuable licenses issued by the Federal Government.

I am sure that during its first busy year of existence, the Board of Directors and officers of the Corporation will resolve many of the most troublesome policy questions, and will make a healthy start toward realizing the full potential of educational broadcasting.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Chairman, the stampede is on. And above the tumult you can hear the cry: "Get this program on the books and hang the consequences."

The more I hear the debate on this measure, the more concerned I become about its implications.

The very fact that the bill's proponents have gone to such lengths to reassure us that the dangers are minimal suggests that my fears may indeed be well-founded.

I do not deny that educational television will revolutionize classroom procedures and has the potential to bring about a level of knowledge undreamed of in the past. As such, educational television deserves the encouragement and support of each of us.

But the scope of this bill goes far beyond the classroom.

To say that this proposal is free of political implications is plainly untrue. There has not been a bill, there has not been a meeting, there has hardly been a conversation since I came to Washington that had not been at least some political overtones.

And I can cite instance after instance where supporters of H.R. 6736, by their own statements, have shown that public television will be political, at least in part.

For example, Fred Friendly has said:

There will be—there should be—times when every man in politics will wish that it had never been created.

The President, in discussing ways of finding financial support for educational television, once said:

Educational television stations will realize their collective potential as the instruments of national purpose in the vast program of social action upon which we are embarked. . . .

Mr. Chairman, this is a clear indication to me that the President is not talking about supplying the information upon which judgments can be based, but rather suggests making the judgments himself and leading the people into agreement.

Furthermore, what is desirable in the way of social action in one part of the country is not necessarily desirable in another. The annual hassle over civil rights between North and South is a good example of that.

Witnesses before the committee not only saw public television as a force for social good, but said it should and will crusade. Crusade for what? I suppose that by the time I have finished this speech, it might well be a crusade for my opponent in next year's election.

It is perfectly well for proponents to say that title II is but a 1-year authorization of only \$9 million. I have heard that one before. There will be no second look. Once this program is underway it will go on and on and on.

As a food-in-the-door proposal, I think it is our duty to look beyond the coming year into the predictable evolution of this program. For this, I turn to the recommendations of the Carnegie Commission, upon whose study the bill is based.

The Commission envisions a 380-station alliance of noncommercial broadcasting outlets reaching into virtually every household in America. It urges the recruitment of top technical, artistic, and specialized personnel as well as preferential rates. It recommends that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare provide facilities for stations now in existence, assist in increasing the number of stations, and help support the basic operations of each outlet.

There is no question in my mind but what programs produced by the Corporation will be used for propaganda purposes, to encourage a particular political philosophy or to keep a political party in power.

And to what recourse can a wronged party turn? The fairness doctrine? It does not have the force of law, but is merely a guideline used on occasion by FCC Commissioners, who, by the way, are appointed by the President. The courts? What good would litigation do when an improper political thought has already been transmitted into nearly every home in America? The Congress? Usually the legislative branch is controlled by the same political party as the White House. Under such circumstances there would be little chance to curb the political excesses of the Public Television Corporation.

We have heard of Federal workers, contrary to law, subjected to pressures to contribute to political fund-raising dinners. We have seen civil servants, contrary to law, lobbying for passage of an administration program.

Do not think for one moment that the Public Television Corporation will be free of political influence. As a matter of fact Federal funds have already been used in a propaganda effort to gain acceptance of this program. The Second National Conference on the Long-Range Financing of Educational Television Stations was held last March here in Washington. Subsequently, a handsome booklet on the highlights of the conference was distributed. It included the following notation:

The Conference reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

I deplore the fact that we are in the process of permitting the Federal Gov-

ernment once again to compete with private enterprise. It seems to me that we will be turning over a virtual monopoly to the Federal bureaucracy. And I am not reassured that competition is lessened by saying that public television programs must be educational or cultural. The Government, with the vast resources at its command, can outbid any of the networks for the services of any performer or technician it wants.

We are told that the Board will be independent thinkers, free of political influence. But they are nevertheless appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, which will make them as independent as, say, the Federal Communications Commission.

Not more than eight members are to be from the same political party. Supposing for the moment that Government officials could serve on the Board, the President might nominate the two Senators from New York. This would fulfill the technical qualifications of the law, but hardly the spirit.

Perhaps it was inevitable that with show business personalities coming into the Federal Government, the Federal Government would naturally go into show business. In a less facetious vein, it may also be inevitable that we will be asked next to authorize a chain of newspapers fulfilling the needs of those whom the administration feels are misinformed. Only recently it was discovered that the OEO had provided \$179,000 for the printing of a weekly newspaper to serve four counties in North Carolina. And in Iowa the same agency was found to be getting their press releases into the local news media on a contract basis.

By its very name, educational television conjures up pictures of the free exchange of ideas. What we are being asked to pass today could hardly be called a major step toward academic freedom. I fear that we may really be setting in motion the means by which ideas will be subverted.

In his book, "1984," George Orwell envisioned an America in which thought control by an all-powerful central government is a substitute for reasoned judgment. What Orwell had in mind may seem like something of a lark by 1984 if this bill is permitted to pass.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Public Broadcasting Act. This measure has three major objectives, all interrelated and yet all possessing distinct and very clear purposes.

H.R. 6736, the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, will:

Assist in providing the broadcast facilities necessary to carry educational television programs to as many of the citizens of this country as possible;

Improve the service of educational broadcasting stations by authorizing a Corporation for Public Broadcasting. This Corporation will constitute a mechanism whereby programs of high quality, responsive to the cultural and educational needs of the people, can be encouraged and made available for use by local stations as they see fit to serve better their communities; and

Authorize a comprehensive study of the role of instructional television. This study would give the authority to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to assess the role of broadcast and related media such as instructional fixed television services, closed circuit, two-way communication of data computer links and other "new technology" in formal classroom instruction.

It is a pleasure to speak in support of H.R. 6736.

The three titles will provide a comprehensive and far-reaching program to enhance the general media of public broadcasting which, briefly defined, constitutes both noncommercial television and radio broadcasting.

The legislation, very simply, builds on our experience, under Public Law 87-447, with the existing program of Federal grants to local communities and other groups to construct or enlarge broadcasting facilities. It adds to this the nonprofit, nongovernmental Corporation for Public Broadcasting and authorizes a study of instructional television.

Title I, then, is nothing new. It is a simple extension of an existing program, allowing for an expansion of the authorization to a total figure of \$10,500,000 in fiscal 1968.

In both the House and Senate hearings on this legislation, many experts, public and private, many legislators and others have dwelt at length with the title II Corporation and also discussed the promise of the title III study.

I would today prefer briefly to explain the existing and highly successful program of noncommercial broadcasting in my own city of New York since it serves as an example of the strong foundation we have both in New York and throughout the country to implement this legislation.

No city in the country has a greater diversity of population and educational needs than New York.

To an appreciable extent, we have made progress toward meeting such needs, with three noncommercial educational television stations already in operation.

These are, first, WNDT, which serves the larger metropolitan area and has become a vanguard station in the production of public television programming. Second, we have WNYC-TV, the municipal station, which has pioneered in the development of programming to fill a variety of professional and postgraduate educational needs. Finally, the city has WNYE-TV, whose operation will in the future make possible significant beginnings toward meeting the highly specialized instructional needs in the schools of the largest community in the country.

But these are only beginnings—and the services provided by these broadcast resources must be increased and expanded.

The legislation before us is essential to the growth of such service. Federal funds which have been available thus far under the ETV Facilities Act have played an important role in the establishment and continuing operation of two of these stations. However, the funds available to the State under the \$1 million limitation have long since been entirely utilized,

and further progress toward meeting needs in the city and throughout the State is dependent on the provisions for Federal assistance which are included in this bill now before us.

Although the facilities which will be eligible for support if we extend the existing program is fundamental to the establishment of new necessary broadcast stations, problems of programming are at least equally crucial.

New York has comprehensive plans already underway for development of a State communications network to interconnect all educational radio and ETV stations.

The capabilities for improvement of public television programs as well as the authorization to assist in providing network services which will be among the responsibilities of the public Corporation proposed in this legislation are essential to the service potential of the New York State network as well as to other parts of the country.

They should be supported and I urge enactment of the Public Broadcasting Act.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my enthusiastic support of this legislation, H.R. 6736. Television in the United States may not be quite the desolate wasteland as Mr. Minow, former Federal Communications Commission Chairman, once remarked. Yet the cost of this proposed legislation is small if it acts at all to give the consumer of American television a wider choice of programs he may watch and if it acts to plant a few small blossoming flowers in the desert.

I would like to include in the RECORD a brief article by the Reverend Daniel Kechel. It describes Mr. Kechel's experience in selecting television worth watching while he was hospitalized and also effectively points up the need for better programs providing educational and cultural enrichment:

DEAR FRIENDS: This convalescence has not been without its interesting moments. I thought it might be draggy with all sorts of limitations, but it has really been charged with excitement.

I had never watched much television but in the last few days I've had a chance to see an abundance of it. The drama has been most gripping. I was caught up the other day in the heartrending story of a little girl who didn't like the taste of an anti-cavity toothpaste. Then her mother discovered the good tasting kind has been proved by leading dental authorities to be "unsurpassed in reducing new cavities." Mother and daughter clasped hands and were reunited in being a one toothpaste family again.

Then there was the tense story of a man who was timing his cigarette to see if it would smoke for seven minutes. I was soon sitting on the edge of my chair. Did you know there are some cigarettes that are not 100 centimeters long? Also, I learned, "it's not how long you make them, it's how you make them long." I'm still working on that, but don't help me.

After years of counseling with troubled persons, tears of joy came to my eyes to see marriages repaired by changing brands of coffee. I saw people once hopelessly separated brought together by a mouthwash. I found myself hissing at the father who took the Right Guard on his business trip and left his family defenseless.

I had to remember that I've been sick and too much of this might be bad for me. My emotions were torn at seeing so many people use the wrong detergents. I also wondered why my doctor hadn't given me any of that stuff for tired blood.

As I went to bed the other night, the question kept nagging me as to what kind of fabric conditioner my wife uses in my pajamas but I couldn't bring myself to ask. Actually, she may not use all the right products but she's a swell gal and I'd rather fight than switch.

DAN KECHEL.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Public Broadcasting Act of 1967".

TITLE I—CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

EXTENSION OF DURATION OF CONSTRUCTION GRANTS FOR EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING

Sec. 101. (a) Section 391 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 391) is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: "There are also authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the purposes of such section, \$10,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, \$12,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970."

(b) The last sentence of such section is amended by striking out "July 1, 1968" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1971".

MAXIMUM ON GRANTS IN ANY STATE

Sec. 102. Effective with respect to grants made from appropriations for any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1967, subsection (b) of section 392 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 392(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The total of the grants made under this part from the appropriation for any fiscal year for the construction of noncommercial educational television broadcasting facilities and noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities in any State may not exceed 8½ per centum of such appropriation."

NONCOMMERCIAL EDUCATIONAL RADIO BROADCASTING FACILITIES

Sec. 103. (a) Section 390 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 390) is amended by inserting "noncommercial" before "educational" and by inserting "or radio" after "television".

(b) Subsection (a) of section 392 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 392(a)) is amended by—

(1) inserting "noncommercial" before "educational" and by inserting "or radio" after "television" in so much thereof as precedes paragraph (1);

(2) striking out clause (B) of such paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof "(B) in the case of a project for television facilities, the State noncommercial educational television agency or, in the case of a project for radio facilities, the State educational radio agency,";

(3) inserting "(1) in the case of a project for television facilities," after "(D)" and "noncommercial" before "educational" in paragraph (1)(D) and by inserting before the semicolon at the end of such paragraph ", or (II) in the case of a project for radio facilities, a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association which is organized primarily to engage in or encourage noncom-

mercial educational radio broadcasting and is eligible to receive a license from the Federal Communications Commission; or meets the requirements of clause (1) and is also organized to engage in or encourage such radio broadcasting and is eligible for such a license for such a radio station";

(4) striking out "television" in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of such subsection;

(5) striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (3), striking out the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

"(5) that, in the case of an application with respect to radio broadcasting facilities, there has been comprehensive planning for educational broadcasting facilities and services in the area the applicant proposes to serve and the applicant has participated in such planning, and the applicant will make the most efficient use of the frequency assignment."

(c) Subsection (c) of such section is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(c)" and "noncommercial" before "educational television broadcasting facilities", and by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) In order to assure proper coordination of construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities within each State which has established a State educational radio agency, each applicant for a grant under this section for a project for construction of such facilities in such State, other than such agency, shall notify such agency of each application for such a grant which is submitted by it to the Secretary, and the Secretary shall advise such agency with respect to the disposition of each such application."

(d) Subsection (d) of such section is amended by inserting "noncommercial" before "educational television" and inserting "or noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, as the case may be," after "educational television broadcasting facilities" in clauses (2) and (3).

(e) Subsection (f) of such section is amended by inserting "or radio" after "television" in the part thereof which precedes paragraph (1), by inserting "noncommercial" before "educational television purposes" in paragraph (2) thereof, and by inserting "or noncommercial educational radio purposes, as the case may be" after "educational television purposes" in such paragraph (2).

(1) Paragraph (2) of section 394 of such Act (47 U.S.C. 394) is amended by inserting "or educational radio broadcasting facilities" after "educational television broadcasting facilities," and by inserting "or radio broadcasting, as the case may be" after "necessary for television broadcasting."

(2) Paragraph (4) of such section is amended by striking out "The term 'State educational television agency' means" and inserting in lieu thereof "The terms 'State educational television agency' and 'State educational radio agency' mean, with respect to television broadcasting and radio broadcasting, respectively," and by striking out "educational television" in clauses (A) and (C) and inserting in lieu thereof "such broadcasting".

(g) Section 397 of such Act (47 U.S.C. 397) is amended by inserting "or radio" after "television" in clause (2).

FEDERAL SHARE OF COST OF CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 104. Subsection (e) of section 392 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 392(e)) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Upon approving any application under this section with respect to any project, the Secretary shall make a grant to the applicant in the amount determined by him, but not exceeding 75 per centum of the amount determined by the Secretary to be the reasonable and necessary cost of such project. The Secretary shall pay such amount

from the sum available therefor, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine."

INCLUSION OF TERRITORIES

SEC. 105. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 394 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by striking out "and" and inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and by inserting before the period at the end thereof "the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands".

(b) Paragraph (4) of such section is amended by inserting "and, in the case of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, means the High Commissioner thereof" before the period at the end thereof.

INCLUSION OF COSTS OF PLANNING

SEC. 106. Paragraph (2) of section 394 of the Communications Act of 1934 is further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "In the case of apparatus the acquisition and installation of which is so included, such term also includes planning therefor."

TITLE II—ESTABLISHMENT OF NON-PROFIT EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING CORPORATION

SEC. 201. Part IV of title III of the Communications Act of 1934 is further amended by—

(1) inserting

"SUBPART A—GRANTS FOR FACILITIES"

Immediately above the heading of section 390;

(2) striking out "part" and inserting in lieu thereof "subpart" in sections 390, 393, 395, and 396;

(3) redesignating section 397 as section 398, and redesignating section 394 as section 397 and inserting it before such section 398, and inserting immediately above its heading the following:

"SUBPART C—GENERAL"

(4) redesignating section 396 as section 394 and inserting it immediately after section 393;

(5) inserting after "broadcasting" the first time it appears in clause (2) of the section of such part IV redesignated herein as section 398, "or over the Corporation or any of its grantees or contractors, or over the charter or bylaws of the Corporation,".

(6) inserting in the section of such part IV herein redesignated as section 397 the following new paragraphs:

"(6) The term 'Corporation' means the Corporation authorized to be established by subpart B of this part.

"(7) The term 'noncommercial educational broadcast station' means a television or radio broadcast station, which (A) under the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission in effect on the date of enactment of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, is eligible to be licensed or is licensed by the Commission as a noncommercial educational radio or television broadcast station and which is owned and operated by a public agency or nonprofit private foundation, corporation, or association or (B) is owned and operated by a municipality and which transmits only noncommercial programs for educational purposes.

"(8) The term 'interconnection' means the use of microwave equipment, boosters, transmitters, repeaters, airborne systems, communication space satellites, or other apparatus or equipment for the transmission and distribution of television or radio programs to noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast stations.

"(9) The term 'educational television or radio programs' means programs which are primarily designed for educational or cultural purposes and not primarily for amusement or entertainment purposes."

(7) striking out the heading of such part IV and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"PART IV—GRANTS FOR NONCOMMERCIAL EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING FACILITIES; CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING"

(8) inserting immediately after the section herein redesignated as section 398 the following:

"EDITORIALIZING AND SUPPORT OF POLITICAL CANDIDATES PROHIBITED

"SEC. 399. No noncommercial educational broadcasting station may engage in editorializing or may support or oppose any candidate for political office."

(9) inserting after section 395 the following new subpart:

"SUBPART B—CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

"Congressional Declaration of Policy

"SEC. 396. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares—

"(1) that it is in the public interest to encourage the growth and development of noncommercial educational radio and television broadcasting, including the use of such media for instructional purposes;

"(2) that expansion and development of noncommercial educational radio and television broadcasting and of diversity of its programming depend on freedom, imagination, and initiative on both the local and national levels;

"(3) that the encouragement and support of noncommercial educational radio and television broadcasting, while matters of importance for private and local development, are also of appropriate and important concern to the Federal Government;

"(4) that it furthers the general welfare to encourage noncommercial educational radio and television broadcast programming which will be responsive to the interests of people both in particular localities and throughout the United States, and which will constitute an expression of diversity and excellence;

"(5) that it is necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to complement, assist, and support a national policy that will most effectively make noncommercial educational radio and television service available to all the citizens of the United States;

"(6) that a private corporation should be created to facilitate the development of educational radio and television broadcasting and to afford maximum protection to such broadcasting from extraneous interference and control.

"Corporation Established

"(b) There is authorized to be established a nonprofit corporation, to be known as the 'Corporation for Public Broadcasting', which will not be an agency or establishment of the United States Government. The Corporation shall be subject to the provisions of this section, and, to the extent consistent with this section, to the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act.

"Board of Directors

"(c)(1) The Corporation shall have a Board of Directors (hereinafter in this section referred to as the 'Board'), consisting of fifteen members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than eight members of the Board may be members of the same political party.

"(2) The members of the Board (A) shall be selected from among citizens of the United States (not regular full-time employees of the United States) who are eminent in such fields as education, cultural and civic affairs or the arts, including radio and television; (B) shall be selected so as to provide as nearly as practicable a broad representation of various regions of the country, various professions and occupations, and various kinds of talent and experience appropriate to

the functions and responsibilities of the Corporation.

"(3) The members of the initial Board of Directors shall serve as incorporators and shall take whatever actions are necessary to establish the Corporation under the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act.

"(4) The term of office of each member of the Board shall be six years; except that (A) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (B) the terms of office of members first taking office shall begin on the date of incorporation and shall expire, as designated at the time of their appointment, five at the end of two years, five at the end of four years, and five at the end of six years. No member shall be eligible to serve in excess of two consecutive terms of six years each. Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this paragraph, a member whose term has expired may serve until his successor has qualified.

"(5) Any vacancy in the Board shall not affect its power, but shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointments were made.

"Election of Chairman; Compensation

"(d) (1) The President shall designate one one of the members first appointed to the Board as Chairman; thereafter the members of the Board shall annually elect one of their number as Chairman. The members of the Board shall also elect one or more of them as a Vice Chairman or Vice Chairmen.

"(2) The members of the Board shall not, by reason of such membership, be deemed to be employees of the United States. They shall, while attending meetings of the Board or while engaged in duties related to such meetings or in other activities of the Board pursuant to this subpart be entitled to receive compensation at the rate of \$100 per day including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence equal to that authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5703) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"Officers and Employees

"(e) (1) The Corporation shall have a President, and such other officers as may be named and appointed by the Board for terms and at rates of compensation fixed by the Board. No individual other than a citizen of the United States may be an officer of the Corporation. No officer of the Corporation, other than the Chairman and any Vice Chairman, may receive any salary or other compensation from any source other than the Corporation during the period of his employment by the Corporation. All officers shall serve at the pleasure of the Board.

"(2) Except as provided in the second sentence of subsection (c) (1) of this section, no political test or qualification shall be used in selecting, appointing, promoting, or taking other personnel actions with respect to officers, agents, and employees of the Corporation.

"Nonprofit and Nonpolitical Nature of the Corporation

"(f) (1) The Corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock, or to declare or pay any dividends.

"(2) No part of the income or assets of the Corporation shall inure to the benefit of any director, officer, employee, or any other individual except as salary or reasonable compensation for services.

"(3) The Corporation may not contribute to or otherwise support any political party or candidate for elective public office.

"Purposes and Activities of the Corporation

"(g) (1) In order to achieve the objectives and to carry out the purposes of this subpart, as set out in subsection (a), the Corporation is authorized to—

"(A) facilitate the full development of educational broadcasting in which programs of high quality, obtained from diverse sources, will be made available to noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast stations, with strict adherence to objectivity and balance in all programs of a controversial nature;

"(B) assist in the establishment and development of a system of interconnection to be used for the distribution of educational television or radio programs so that all noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast stations that wish to may broadcast the programs at times chosen by the stations;

"(C) assist in the establishment and development of one or more systems of noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast stations throughout the United States;

"(D) carry out its purposes and functions and engage in its activities in ways that will most effectively assure the maximum freedom of the noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast systems and local stations from interference with or control of program content or other activities.

"(2) Included in the activities of the Corporation authorized for accomplishment of the purposes set forth in subsection (a) of this section, are, among others not specifically named—

"(A) to obtain grants from and to make contracts with individuals and with private, State, and Federal agencies, organizations, and institutions;

"(B) to contract with or make grants to program production entities, individuals, and selected noncommercial educational broadcast stations for the production of, and otherwise to procure, educational television or radio programs for national or regional distribution to noncommercial educational broadcast stations;

"(C) to make payments to existing and new noncommercial educational broadcast stations to aid in financing local educational television or radio programming costs of such stations, particularly innovative approaches thereto, and other costs of operation of such stations;

"(D) to establish and maintain a library and archives of noncommercial educational television or radio programs and related materials and develop public awareness of and disseminate information about noncommercial educational television or radio broadcasting by various means, including the publication of a journal;

"(E) to arrange, by grant or contract with appropriate public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, or institutions, for interconnection facilities suitable for distribution and transmission of educational television or radio programs to noncommercial educational broadcast stations;

"(F) to hire or accept the voluntary services of consultants, experts, advisory boards, and panels to aid the Corporation in carrying out the purposes of this section;

"(G) to encourage the creation of new noncommercial educational broadcast stations in order to enhance such service on a local, State, regional, and national basis;

"(H) conduct (directly or through grants or contracts) research, demonstrations, or training in matters related to noncommercial educational television or radio broadcasting.

"(3) To carry out the foregoing purposes and engage in the foregoing activities, the Corporation shall have the usual powers conferred upon a nonprofit corporation by the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act, except that the Corporation may not own or operate any television or radio broadcast station, system, or network, or interconnection or program production facility.

"Authorization for Free or Reduced Rate Interconnection Service

"(h) Nothing in the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, or in any other provi-

sion of law shall be construed to prevent United States communications common carriers from rendering free or reduced rate communications interconnection services to grantees of or contractors with the Corporation and local noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast stations, subject to such rules and regulations as the Federal Communications Commission may prescribe.

"Report to Congress

"(i) The Corporation shall submit an annual report for the preceding fiscal year ending June 30 to the President for transmittal to the Congress on or before the 31st day of December of each year. The report shall include a comprehensive and detailed report of the Corporation's operations, activities, financial condition, and accomplishments under this section and may include such recommendations as the Corporation deems appropriate.

"Right To Repeal, Alter, or Amend

"(j) The right to repeal, alter, or amend this section at any time is expressly reserved.

"Financing

"(k) (1) There are authorized to be appropriated for expenses of the Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the sum of \$9,000,000, to remain available until expended.

"(2) Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this section, no grant or contract pursuant to this section may provide for payment from the appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, for any one project or to any one station of more than \$250,000.

"Records and Audit

"(l) (1) (A) The accounts of the Corporation shall be audited annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by independent certified public accountants or independent licensed public accountants certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State or other political subdivision of the United States. The audits shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the Corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the Corporation and necessary to facilitate the audits shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audits; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

"(B) The report of each such independent audit shall be included in the annual report required by subsection (i) of this section. The audit report shall set forth the scope of the audit and include such statements as are necessary to present fairly the Corporation's assets and liabilities, surplus or deficit, with an analysis of the changes therein during the year, supplemented in reasonable detail by a statement of the Corporation's income and expenses during the year, and a statement of the sources and application of funds, together with the independent auditor's opinion of those statements.

"(2) (A) The financial transaction of the Corporation for any fiscal year during which Federal funds are available to finance any portion of its operation shall be subject to audit by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where accounts of the Corporation are normally kept. The representative of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the Corporation pertaining to its financial transactions and

necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians. All such books, accounts, records, reports, files, papers and property of the Corporation shall remain in possession and custody of the Corporation.

"(B) A report of each such audit shall be made by the Comptroller General to the Congress. The report to the Congress shall contain such comments and information as the Comptroller General may deem necessary to inform Congress of the financial operations and condition of the Corporation, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as he may deem advisable. The report shall also show specifically any program, expenditure, or other financial transaction or understanding observed in the course of the audit, which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on or made without authority of law. A copy of each report shall be furnished to the President, to the Secretary, and to the Corporation at the time submitted to the Congress.

"(3) (A) Each recipient of assistance by grant or contract, other than a fixed price contract awarded pursuant to competitive bidding procedures, under this section shall keep such records as may be reasonably necessary to fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(B) The Corporation or any of its duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance received under this section. The Comptroller General of the United States or any of his duly authorized representatives shall also have access thereto for such purpose during any fiscal year for which Federal funds are available to the Corporation."

TITLE III—STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL AND INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION BROADCASTING

STUDY AUTHORIZED

Sec. 301. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to conduct, directly or by contract, and in consultation with other interested Federal agencies, a study of instructional television, including its relationship to educational television broadcasting and such other aspects thereof as may assist in determining whether Federal aid should be provided therefor and the form that aid should take, and which may aid communities, institutions, or agencies in determining whether and to what extent such activities should be used.

CONTENT OF STUDY

Sec. 302. Such study shall be comprehensive in nature and shall cover particularly such items as:

- (1) the quality and content of existing programs and how they can be improved;
- (2) the financial factors involved in use of instructional television in educational institutions;
- (3) the relative advantages or disadvantages of using instructional television as compared with other media;
- (4) the advantages and disadvantages of closed-circuit television;
- (5) the relationship between instructional and educational television; and
- (6) new technology not now available including flexible teacher-controlled scheduling of programs based on videotapes, discs, films, and other materials or devices.

DURATION OF STUDY

SEC. 303. The study authorized by this title shall be submitted to the President for transmittal to the Congress on or before January 1, 1969.

APPROPRIATION

SEC. 304. There are authorized to be appropriated for the study authorized by this title such sums, not exceeding \$500,000, as may be necessary.

Mr. STAGGERS (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee substitute amendment be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 269]

Adams	Edwards, Calif.	Minshall
Ashley	Everett	Murphy, N.Y.
Aspinall	Evins, Tenn.	Pool
Baring	Feighan	Pucinski
Belcher	Findley	Purcell
Blackburn	Fino	Quillen
Brinkley	Fountain	Rarick
Broomfield	Garmatz	Rhodes, Pa.
Brown, Calif.	Glaimo	Riegle
Brown, Mich.	Gray	Smith, Calif.
Button	Hagan	Stafford
Celler	Hamilton	Stratton
Cleveland	Hanna	Taft
Conte	Hays	Tenzer
Corman	Hébert	Utt
Daddario	Herlong	Watkins
Davis, Wis.	Hollifield	Williams, Miss.
Dawson	Holland	Williams, Pa.
de la Garza	Hutchinson	Willis
Derwinski	Irwin	Wolf
Diggs	Kluczynski	Wyatt
Dingell	Leggett	Young
Edmondson	Long, La.	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GALLAGHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 737, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 364 Members answered to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. Prior to the quorum call, the committee substitute amendment, as printed in the bill, by unanimous consent had been ordered considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OTTINGER

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OTTINGER: On page 22, line 11, insert the following:

"(4) striking the semi-colon at the end of paragraph (1) and adding thereto the following:

"or (E) a municipality which owns and operates a broadcasting facility transmitting only noncommercial programs;"

And renumbering paragraphs (4) and (5) as (5) and (6) respectively.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OTTINGER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, as a longtime supporter of noncommercial television, I rise in support of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. I am pleased that my enthusiasm for this bill is shared by so many of my colleagues as well as the administration, the broadcast industry and the public at large. I believe that this measure is essential if we are to strengthen non-commercial broadcasting.

In evaluating this bill I think it is important to recognize that it will not cause the Federal Government to compete with the private radio and television industry. Rather, the activities of the Federal Government and the Corporation which it will support, will provide a much needed supplement to existing commercial broadcasting.

The stations to be aided by this measure are those providing educational, cultural, and public service program. This type of programming is not presently available on commercial stations because it is impossible to profitably broadcast a significant number of programs of this type. Such programming can only be undertaken by individuals and organizations which are not profit oriented.

Because of the limited resources of the charitable foundations and educational institutions that have thus far provided the financial support for this programming, we must form a partnership between the Federal Government and these institutions if the potential of such broadcasting is to be fully developed. To create a viable network of broadcast stations and the requisite production capacity will require the infusion of considerable additional sums of money, sums which are available only from the Federal Government.

After careful study I have concluded that each of the three major features of this bill makes a unique contribution to the future of American broadcasting and therefore merits our support.

The first title of the measure substantially increases Federal financial support of instructional broadcasting. This recent educational innovation has achieved remarkably enthusiastic acceptance by educators representing every level of our educational complex. Educators have recognized that this medium offers perhaps our best opportunity to provide short-run relief for the critical shortage of teachers now confronting our Nation. Further, it permits a school system to offer an extraordinarily diverse and sophisticated curriculum at minimum cost.

Title II, which establishes the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, holds perhaps the greatest potential for innovation. This Corporation, carefully insulated from outside political influences, will determine which broadcast stations and production facilities receive Federal aid. The success or failure of the entire

concept of public broadcasting will largely be determined by the caliber of the work done by the Corporation and the aid recipients. With proper management this Corporation can employ the wide administrative discretion it has been given to achieve unparalleled success in its broadcast endeavors.

Although little money is authorized for the work to be done under title III of this bill, I think this provision, which finances a study of the future of educational television, is of the utmost importance. Before we commit large sums of money to this undertaking it is imperative that we establish clearly defined goals and priorities. These will necessarily flow from the study required by title III.

I take this opportunity to share with my colleagues two letters which I received earlier this year from constituents who are involved with WXXI, an excellent educational television station in my home town of Rochester, N.Y. The first of these letters is from Mr. Harold Hacker, the immediate past president of the Rochester Area Educational Television Association and the second is from the Rt. Rev. Msgr. William Roche, superintendent of Catholic schools in Rochester. The letters follow:

ROCHESTER AREA EDUCATIONAL
TELEVISION ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Rochester, N.Y., May 24, 1967.

Re: S. 1160/H.R. 6845.

HON. FRANK HORTON,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: I am writing to you on behalf of the Board of Trustees of the Rochester Area Educational Television Association to request your active assistance in persuading Representative Harley O. Staggers, chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, to schedule early hearings on the Public Television Bill. I realize that you are very familiar with the bill and its exciting potentials for improved ETV throughout the United States, so I won't make this a long letter.

Of particular concern to RAETA's trustees are the major provisions (in Title II) that would create a Public Television Corporation and provide national leadership for much-needed programming and interconnection among the ETV stations in the country so that Channel 21 here in Rochester may have access to far greater programming resources than we do today. This same Title provides an appropriation of \$9 million for the Corporation, part of which will be used for contracts for programming from local stations and part to assist in supporting the local programming operations of stations, such as Channel 21.

We also have more than passing interest in Title I, which provides federal matching grants for the construction of facilities since we hope to switch to color for video-taping and filming over Channel 21 in 1968.

It is my understanding that the Senate is preparing to vote on S. 1160 in the very near future, since it was approved by the Senate Commerce Committee by an overwhelming margin. However, nothing will happen until the House gets into the act and here Representative Staggers is the key man. He has announced his intention to await the Senate vote before scheduling hearings.

All of us would be most grateful to you if you would ask Representative Staggers to schedule hearings at the earliest possible date. It means so much to the Rochester community and to RAETA that I cannot do justice to the need for early action and approval by Congress. If Congress approves the

Public Television Bill, it will be one of the major educational contributions of the federal government to the people of the United States in the long history of our country—in my opinion.

Thanks ever so much for your interest and your help.

Cordially yours,

HAROLD S. HACKER,
President.

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS,
DIOCESE OF ROCHESTER,
June 23, 1967.

HON. FRANK HORTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: As a member of the Board of Directors, Rochester Area Television Association, I should like to enlist your support in persuading Representative Harley Staggers to hold hearings on the Public Broadcast Bill.

As you know, RAETA is more important to our community with each passing day, and like other nonprofit corporations financed by private support, is in great financial need.

In our efforts to upgrade RAETA programming and facilities, we would hope that you would urge Representative Staggers to hold these hearings without undue delay.

We sincerely appreciate your kind efforts on behalf of RAETA.

Very truly yours,

Rt. Rev. Msgr. WILLIAM M. ROCHE,
Superintendent of Schools,
Board Member, RAETA.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OTTINGER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, we on this side, I believe, have accepted this amendment because I believe it merely perfects what we did in the committee; we inserted this in one section of the bill, and this was not inserted in the other section.

We have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on behalf of my friend and colleague from New York, Mr. JOHN MURPHY, who is presently taking part as a delegate to the constitutional convention modernizing our State constitution.

The amendment makes clear the qualification to receive construction funds under this act, municipally owned broadcasting facilities which transmit only noncommercial programs. Without the amendment, this qualification might be in some doubt through inadvertent omission from the present legislation of such municipal ETV stations.

New York has a very fine municipally owned ETV station, channel 13. It offers as fine an educational program presentation as can be found anywhere in the Nation. It is as deserving of participation in this program as any ETV station in the land.

Mr. MURPHY is to be commended for his farsightedness in noting the deficiency in the existing legislation which cast doubt on the ability of municipally owned ETV stations to participate in this fine program and in taking this action to correct the situation. I hope the committee will support the amendment.

(Mr. OTTINGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WATSON

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WATSON: Beginning with line 20 on page 25, strike out all down through line 14 on page 40.

Redesignate title III and the sections therein accordingly.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I believe the amendment we are proposing now—and I am not offering it just personally, but I am offering it in behalf of a number of others who are concerned about title II of this particular measure.

Mr. Chairman, I want it clearly understood that those of us who are seeking to delete title II, the so-called Public Broadcasting Corporation provision of this measure, are in no way opposed to local ETV. Personally, I have always supported it. We were one of the active backers of it down in my beloved and progressive State of South Carolina back in 1957, I believe it was. In fact, I will tell the Members now that if we are successful in deleting title II, the Public Broadcasting Corporation, then I will personally urge the Committee to increase the amount of money under title I, which will go back to the local ETV stations for programming.

Now, why do we oppose this particular section? First, if you are going to create this new Public Broadcasting Corporation you are going to put it into direct competition with your local ETV stations. They are going to be competing for personnel. Already the local ETV stations have problems for the simple reason that the localities are not able to offer as much, salarywise, as the commercial stations are able to offer. Additionally, the Public Broadcasting Corporation will be in competition with the local ETV stations in trying to solicit private contributions.

Frankly, this is a potential monster—this title II.

Others will say there is no definite means of financing and that we only give it \$9 million anyhow.

Some will say that we will come back next year and take a look at it.

Let us be realistic about this matter. Nothing is so permanent as a temporary Government program. If this is launched now, it is going to have to be financed in the future and according to the Carnegie Commission, it is estimated that this will ultimately cost \$270 million a year.

Another thing that is of serious consequence so far as this particular title II is concerned is the matter of editorializing. I know that the committee wrote in the bill that there shall be no editorializing on the part of the Public Broadcasting Corporation. Perhaps there will not be. But let me tell you this. We do not need to worry about the editorials—the people know that they are subjective. But what about the program? The editorials are not nearly so influential as the regular programs. But if you let me control the content of the programs that will

be distributed to your local stations you can forget about the editorializing aspect of it altogether. I will control the thinking of the viewing audience.

Some will say if you strike out title II, you strike the guts of the bill. Nothing is further from the truth. This is entirely a new program. The thrust of the whole ETV movement—the real meat of the matter is the finances in order to have the proper facilities and equipment and additionally in order to get the programs, that are necessary.

The head of the South Carolina ETV system said, and we have a good one down there—

We agree there is a place for cultural programs, and a place for symphonies, the ballet and so forth—

Which is primarily what the Public Broadcasting Corporation will be engaged in and he said:

We are far more impressed with the fact that 150,000 South Carolina school children and 100,000 adults enrolled this year in a course of education instruction as a result of ETV.

We need right now the bread-and-butter aspects of it. If we do not have the facilities, it makes no difference whether you have the finest symphonies in the world—if you do not have the facilities to transmit it to the people.

Frankly, let us get to the basics of this matter. Help your local TV systems and give them additional money under title I. Do not create a Federal monster here, and put that Public Corporation in competition with your local ETV station.

Some will say that this new Corporation will be financed by private contributions. Let us be realistic. Once the Federal Government steps into it, the private sources will dry up as they should dry up.

So far as the financing is concerned, no one knows how it will be financed. No one knows how much it will cost. There will be no realistic control of the program. Your local people need money, not Federal domination. Let us help them through title I and not create this new monster which actually would be in competition with them rather than really helping them.

I hope that you will go along with the amendment to strike out title II.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in our committee we had 80 witnesses from every stratum of life and from every section of the country, who came before the committee and testified in favor of this bill, with the exception of one witness.

I want to read again from the letter which, as I previously mentioned, was just given to me as I came here to the table.

This letter is from the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. That is all the State universities in America and all the land-grant colleges in America.

Part of the letter reads as follows:

The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges would like to re-emphasize its strong support for the passage of H.R. 6736, the Public Broadcasting Bill of 1967.

The letter also points out:

The Public Broadcasting Bill has been compared in importance to education in the United States to the Morrill Act of 1862 establishing the country's unique land-grant system of colleges and universities. We strongly urge your continued support for the legislation that would continue and accelerate the development of this unique educational resource.

Mr. Chairman, these are the top educators of America. Moreover, the president of the University of South Carolina, Thomas F. Jones, which is in the State of the gentleman who just spoke, is referred to in the letter as supporting this legislation. I would like to read this statement from the letter:

The Association presented testimony in support of the legislation directly through the enclosed statement of President Thomas F. Jones of the University of South Carolina. He is Chairman of the Association's Committee on Educational Telecommunication.

It has been said that this would impair the commercial broadcasting networks. Every one of the networks came in and testified they were for this bill and feared no competition from the noncommercial educational stations which will be assisted by it. As already stated, Frank Stanton, president of CBS, said it would contribute \$1 million when the Corporation was started.

If you cut out the Corporation, you will have no general interconnection between all the educational broadcast stations. All you are going to have is isolated ETC in small sections of America. You might have the finest program in Iowa, but other areas will not be able to share it. We need an educational broadcasting system in which we can work together. This will add strength to the land. That is why educators say they want this bill. When you have some good program in one section of the country or something is happening there of great importance, with interconnection it can be carried to every section of America.

As I have said, title II of the bill has been supported by every phase of American life that I know of, as testified to by the witnesses who appeared before the committee. It is insulated from Government control in every way that the 33 members of our committee could devise. I think we have the intelligence on the committee to do a pretty good job, and I think we have done an excellent job on this bill. There is fear, yes. But, as I said awhile ago, Columbus would never have crossed the ocean if he had resolved all the fears that he and his men might have had before they set off. We would not have a single thing in this land if we had attempted to resolve all our fears before we started to embark upon a new venture. The learned men of the land have said that this is one of the greatest things that could happen to us. Many have said it is probably the most important piece of legislation that will come out of this 90th Congress, and I agree with that statement.

I am in complete sympathy with the commercial TV programs because they do a good job. They are getting paid through advertisements. They have advanced the social life of America. This is a proposal to advance the cultural

life of our land. In accepting our responsibility we must do everything we can to do just that. That is part of our responsibility.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. We have been talking about the policy involved. I am wondering if it is proposed to set up an intertie in the educational television system. How will we get this interconnection of the television stations? What is the mechanical means of getting this network of communications, so to speak?

Mr. STAGGERS. They will use the same kind of system that the commercial broadcasting systems use. They will have to use the systems that are already set up now. We have said that. But they would not own any network whatsoever.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KYL. I would like to continue this dialog for a moment. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Would the gentleman repeat his question?

Mr. KYL. I pose this question first: Are we going to use the coaxial cable system or the microwave system?

Mr. STAGGERS. The bill provides that every means can be used.

Mr. KYL. You say we are going to use every means. Are we going to use both the microwave system and the coaxial cable system?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say that the public corporation could enter into contracts with the communication systems for the purpose of making an interconnection on a spot basis. They will not have enough money to run a network. They are forbidden to run a network.

If there is a program of national importance and the board of directors come to the conclusion that they can, they may enter into a contract with I.T. & T. or A.T. & T., for instance, to use microwave or coaxial cable, either one, and probably in the same way that commercial stations do. They may use the ordinary means of communication, such as any network would use, in making a spot communication.

Mr. KYL. In other words, the gentleman is trying to tell me there is no institution, no medium, no means of doing now, without a national corporation, that which would be accomplished with the creation of a network through a corporation of this nature?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is only a small part of it. The big part is in the field of programs themselves.

Mr. KYL. Oh, then we get back to the comment of the gentleman from South Carolina on programming.

Mr. SPRINGER. If the gentleman will give me a minute, I will explain what the

programing is. They do not make any programs, but they execute contracts for programs, the same as they may contract for spot connections for a national program, but they may not have a network for themselves.

Mr. KYL. Are there any agencies in the field for programing at the present time?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes. But no agency for either paying for or collecting it, arranging it, and that is the purpose of the public corporation.

Mr. KYL. Is the gentleman serious when he says there is now no entity for accomplishing this purpose?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is true. There is no entity now that can do it or has the money to put this into operation.

Mr. KYL. There is no interplay or no interstation activity for this?

Mr. SPRINGER. There is only this one thing. There is educational TV which has an office in New York. If anyone wants to have this—in other words, if there is something, and an example I gave a few minutes ago was the Israel-Arab war, when they wanted to do something in depth. They prepared a program and sent it out to Ann Arbor, where this is prepared and canned. It took 10 days to do this. The war lasted only 6 days. We want them to be able to do the same day's news on the same day. At the present time, they do not have the ability to do that.

Mr. KYL. At the present time they do not use the present news network services?

Mr. SPRINGER. No, they cannot.

Mr. KYL. And if we do have this Corporation, we assume it will have to have the same news-gathering services as others?

Mr. SPRINGER. Either that or they will have to contract for it.

Mr. KYL. With whom will they contract?

Mr. SPRINGER. They will contract with someone to produce that each day.

Mr. KYL. With whom are they going to contract to do it?

Mr. SPRINGER. With any agency that is performing that kind of job. I do not know. Whoever it is, it is with them they will have the contract.

Mr. KYL. Obviously, it would have to be the radio or television station, would it not?

Mr. SPRINGER. That I cannot say. They would have to contract for it if they cannot do it.

Mr. KYL. I can understand why the agencies would be interested in getting this kind of thing established. This is one millstone they do have around their necks, this in-depth news coverage, from which they would be free.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I am directing this mostly to my colleagues who were not here when I spoke before, but I think there are some things that ought to be emphasized so that everybody will have at least the same perspective, insofar as I can bring it about. In the reading of the views—and I hope my colleagues will read the views—we do have minority views of six Members of the minority immediately following the report. I think my col-

leagues would do well to read both the majority views and the minority views, to know what our thinking was in these matters.

I know there was a great deal of skepticism, but if we will read the RECORD which was made in 1961, when this was voted on, we will see there were 49 against and 330 for it. There was voiced on the floor of this House at that time, in 1961, the thought about the danger of allowing Federal moneys to get into this whole field of television for the purpose of establishing television stations or assisting the existing television stations in the noncommercial educational field at that time.

There was a danger that in allowing this money Federal control would follow it. Yet anyone who has had any experience in the past 6 years knows there has not been the slightest control of any kind exercised by the Federal Government in making grants. They have made grants to 137 separate stations, of which 92 have been completely built out of the money. There are some 47 stations which have been helped by that money, and there has never been any allegation of any kind by anyone that there has been any Federal control.

Now we come, I believe, to the first progressive step we would make in this whole field at this time; that is, on the question of assisting these stations which are simply program starved. I happen to have one of the big ones in my district. I do not plead for that reason.

When I see some of the programing, I can see why the station itself simply does not have the programs I would visualize an educational noncommercial station which has no advertising would want.

The purpose of this corporation is to produce these programs or to contract for the production of these programs not in the commercial field. They will not take over the area of operation of ABC, by CBS or by NBC. They are not interested in that kind of programing.

Educational stations are interested in the arts, in science, in documentaries in depth, and news in depth. This is something we are not getting, and something which the commercial stations, because of the way in which they are set up, to make a profit, are not able to supply.

This is the direction in which I believe we are going with the public corporation.

Let me say that two amendments were added. I will be brief in this regard.

In the first amendment, the Board of Directors we set up in the bill, on the basis of an amendment I offered, was limited to no more than eight of the directors of one party. This was an attempt to get us out of the field of politics, to see if we could not get it on the same basis as the Federal Communications Commission, where they have five to four, or four to three, as an arrangement. We felt, with the minority present all of the time checking on the majority, there would be no chance for hanky-panky. This was one of the things we were concerned about.

The second thing concerned whether or not someone could get control over the programs. We felt that we ought to take a position against editorializing. We know

that this goes contrary to the rule in commercial television, where they can editorialize.

May I say that the representatives of the noncommercial educational TV group came to my office and said, "We support that amendment. We do not want to be in politics. We want to get as far away as we can from any connection with politics or from any assertion that we are taking a one-sided position on anything."

These two amendments we thought were vitally important, to be certain that this program was fair and that we would not be looking at the administration, either Republican or Democratic, with a jaundiced eye, and a feeling that the program was not going to be fair and in perspective.

May I say in reply to my distinguished colleague from South Carolina, who says he would give more and increased money for the educational TV stations at home, we do not need that. Thirty-eight million dollars is budgeted. There is a \$10.5 million this year, \$12.5 million in the next year and \$15 million the next year. That makes the total \$38 million. That is all they need. We do not need more money for these stations.

They put 92 stations, brand new ones, on the air, and helped 47, including that of my distinguished colleague from South Carolina and his university.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SPRINGER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SPRINGER. His distinguished president of his great university in South Carolina came up and testified for the bill.

I know how earnestly the gentleman feels. May I say that my colleagues on my side of the aisle who differ with me are just as conscientious in the public interest as I am. I want to pay tribute to all of them, for they have done careful thinking. It is just a difference in how we look at the approach, and what we might consider dangers of having a public corporation.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WATSON. The first point the gentleman made was that there was no problem in the present bill. I agree thoroughly, because the present bill only provides money grants for facilities and equipment. It provides not one dime for programs.

If the Members believe the Federal Government ought to provide textbooks for schools back home, then they should vote for this, because the programs for ETV are the textbooks in the schools. It is as simple as that.

If the Members believe the Federal Government ought to say what they ought to be taught in the school districts, by buying the school textbooks, then they should vote for this. That is as simple as it can be. Those programs are your textbooks for educational TV.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to my distinguished colleague that the whole question of instructional TV is not covered

here except under title III, where we have a \$500,000 appropriation to make a study in depth as to what ought to be done in the field of instructional TV. That is as far as this bill goes. I think the \$500,000 is warranted, because we ought to have a study of this in depth.

May I say that my own university does some of this. Purdue is one of the best in the country. My distinguished colleague from Indiana, in whose district Purdue University lies, never made an allegation of any kind that I know of.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I hope we can keep this all in context, but I do believe this whole question of instructional TV ought to be studied very thoroughly.

May I say with due credit to my distinguished colleague from Ohio, who is very vitally interested in the whole question of instructional TV, that he wanted to limit the bill more or less to instructional TV. I do not feel now is the time it ought to be limited to instructional TV. We ought to be now in the field of noncommercial TV broadcasting which is more or less directed at the whole question. We have arrived at that point in history. But I do believe the next great step to be taken in this field will be when we have completed this study under title III and see what we have to do in the field of instructional TV.

I yield to the gentleman from Kansas, who was on his feet first.

Mr. MIZE. Earlier in the afternoon the gentleman in the well explained the individual educational TV stations are under no obligation whatever to take any of the programs developed by this corporation. Is that correct?

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say that there will be stations galore that will not want some of these programs simply because it does not fit their area or fit their type of programing, or for other reasons. I imagine if you have something as sensational as the Israel-Arab war and you sent out something of that kind, they would probably put it on the air, because out of 160 stations 150 would want it as important news.

Mr. MIZE. But they are not obliged to take it?

Mr. SPRINGER. They do not have to take it if they do not want to. There will be a great deal of variation in programing and there will have to be, because certain areas will be interested in certain things. For example, New York will not be interested in things that would interest New Mexico, Texas, or Colorado.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If I may, I would like to clarify the three segments of this bill for our colleagues.

Title I of this legislation provides funds for the construction of educational TV facilities—radio and TV.

Title II, which is the title in issue here and which the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina is designed to strike completely, is to provide a public corporation manned by appointees of the

President and provides funds to enter into the field of programing.

Title III is to do a thorough study of instructional TV for future legislative reference by the Congress.

I am enthusiastically in favor of titles I and III. I have serious reservations about title II for the simple reason that title II gets into the programing area.

Title III I have no objection to because instructional TV, as the gentleman pointed out, offers this Congress and the people of this country the opportunity, perhaps, to save money in their educational procedures the way they are now oriented. However, title II carries—

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to the gentleman I only have so much time. I appreciate having his statement, but I would appreciate his taking his own time for it if he could. If I had a little more time, I would be glad to yield to him, but I do have some additional comments I would like to make.

May I say this—and wind up here—I believe the important thing is what we do with this bill that improves what we have already done.

It is true, as the gentleman from Ohio mentioned, that title III does have provision for a \$500,000 study for instructional TV. However, the only progressive improvement contained in this bill in my opinion is contained in title II. If we do not take title II, then we have the same bill that we had in 1961 in which we just granted money to TV stations in order to get on the air. That is not what I visualize at this point and time in history, in 1967.

Gentlemen, they are starving to death, and some of the people who look at those stations realize that these stations do not have adequate programing. It is in these fields which are not covered by commercial TV that noneducational commercial TV has its great opportunity for the future. It is in the sciences, the arts, music, the documentaries, and news in depth.

Mr. Chairman, unless we proceed by philosophy, I do not see any possibility for the improvement overall in the non-commercial educational TV field.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out the fact that while I earlier had an exchange with the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON], whose integrity and beliefs I have no reason to quarrel with, the fact is that a representative from his great State of South Carolina came up and indicated that most of the Southern States needed this type of program.

Further, Mr. Chairman, at this point I would like to point out something that is not understood, I do not believe, by people who have never read the bill thoroughly, and that is the fact that, by law, and under the provisions of the bill

which we are undertaking to pass—and in my opinion a bill which will be passed—this will be a nongovernmental agency.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, when the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina says that the textbooks of this country and of all the States will be subjected to governmental approval, in my opinion the gentleman is just absolutely incorrect.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman when I finish by initial statement.

Mr. Chairman, I say this because on page 29 of the bill, in title II—and this is a very basic part of the bill—it states that one of the purposes of the enactment of this title would be the fact that a private corporation—repeat private—should be created to facilitate the development of educational radio and television broadcasting and to afford maximum protection to such broadcasters from extraneous interference and controls. To my mind, “extraneous interference and control” can only mean any interference from the Government. That is why it is written into the provisions of the bill, that no member of this Commission, when appointed, can be a governmental employee and that they cannot serve as a governmental employee; they serve only from the standpoint of public service in their particular field of expertise. Therefore, I say to all the people in this country who talk against commercial TV and who say that they are given no choice in commercial TV, today the Congress is given a choice to create an agency that will present worthwhile programs to this country. Yet, Mr. Chairman, the bugaboo of Federal control is raised in opposition thereto.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the distinguished gentleman from Illinois has just said and that is the fact that we have written into the bill guarantees that a majority of this corporation or group cannot be of any one party or of a certain party. I would not like to use my own words, but I would like to use the words of someone who is deeply interested in this matter, Dr. Frank Stanton, president of CBS, and one may find his statement with reference to the matter contained on page 17 of the committee report.

He described the functions as he sees them of the other so-called network. He said:

They—

And he means educational TV stations—

They will do special things that we don't do in quantity at the present time. I would expect that they will appeal at certain times of the day to very small parts of the total audience. Because we are organized as a mass medium, because we have to serve the greatest number of people in order to do our job, they will be able to do special interest kinds of programing that we can't do.

Here is a man who represents the biggest single network in the country who has guaranteed his network will give \$1 million to this so-called educational TV, because he thinks the programing of

the commercial TV has fallen short of the goals that were set forth when we entered into setting up the Communications Act of 1934.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. I will yield to the gentleman in just one moment.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to read the words of the gentleman who represented South Carolina in testifying before our committee, in which he said:

I do not know all the answers. I run a university in South Carolina, and look at much of the poverty and ignorance that pervades our world.

He said further, on the same page:

We must innovate, we must provide funds for innovation, we must foster communications, these are things for which now there are no funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina to strike title II.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to review some of the points which have been developed today with respect to this legislation, and also to discuss title II, which is the issue before us at the moment.

Title II includes \$9 million for the establishment of a public corporation to provide and distribute funds for programming for the ETV stations throughout the country. This is only a drop in the bucket of what the costs will ultimately be because, according to the Carnegie Foundation, this legislation aims at creating an eventual 390 ETV stations, not to mention radio stations which are now provided for in this legislation, and the cost for the operation of these stations will be at least \$270 million a year.

Those of you who intend to vote for the tax increase I am sure will have no trouble with these facts, but some of us who may have that intention are a little concerned about where that \$270 million is going to come from.

In my own area, Ohio State University plans to televise classroom instruction to the other institutions of higher learning in Ohio, and also to the public schools in that State. Some of these programs will be live; some of them will be on tape. I believe it will serve a valid purpose to have funds budgeted by which to do this. And of course the university would be happy to have some additional Federal money to help out. But I would much prefer, if we are going to give away \$9 million of the taxpayers' money now and an eventual \$270 million a year, that we give it directly to that institution, and not filter it through a public corporation whose members are to be appointed by the President of the United States. Incidentally, these Ohio State programs will not be in competition with private television, because they will be primarily for classroom instruction.

So if, as my chairman asks, we are going to maintain the strength of this country, let us maintain it through diver-

sity rather than through getting a common view from the national level of the news and the public issues of our day.

It has been pointed out that this is not a network. That is true, but the corporation can decide who gets the grants and for what programs. It will not be a BBC; it will be more like a domestic U.S. Information Agency, deciding who makes the programs; and, if the right person is not going to make the kind of a program, the corporation feels is desirable, presumably that person will not get the Federal money.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare says that one of the objectives of this legislation is cultural uplift. I wonder who is going to make the decision as to what is cultural and what is not cultural.

What kind of television and radio programs go into cultural uplift? Certainly, news programs to some extent. But whose views of the news?

I will tell you this, I do not mind editorials because viewers do not pay as much attention to editorials as they do the news. I could influence more people by being able to wiggle the eyebrows of the newscaster or decide what is to be produced and who will be in it and what the voice inflection of the newscaster will be. This is exactly the kind of decision the public corporation will be making. It will have the opportunity to do it because, in the programming, corporation officials will help to select the newscaster or the person who is approved to make this program and what this program will be about.

One of the people who testified before us said that the Congress is going to provide through this means an opportunity for local programming to include high school athletic events. I do not know how cultural that is, but I do know that the little radio stations in my part of the country sell their high school athletic events to sponsors as a part of their economic survival.

We had a lot of testimony before this committee, as my chairman pointed out, in favor of this legislation. I think we only heard from one local commercial station, however.

Of course, the networks are for it because, if ETV does all the public service programming in the country, perhaps salable prime time will not be preempted by coverage of the United Nations and the commercial networks will be able to get that much more advertising money.

It has been suggested that we would have coverage of government at the local and State level and that we would have public issue programs. Our distinguished minority leader on the committee pointed out several times in the committee that the very selection of what is a "public service or public interest broadcast" has editorial overtones to it. Perhaps if we did a public service program on Bobby Baker, it might have some political implications.

I say that we ought to keep the ETV stations as instructional and truly educational and as local as possible, and the only way to keep them local and educational is to have local moneys going into

their programming. A good deal of local money is going into them from the State governments now and they are staying closer to the original purpose of this legislation than they will if we offer the Federal corporation financing proposed under title II.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it is easy for committee members to take up all the time, and I wonder if there is any desire or any intention to cut off debate here before those of us who are not members of the committee have a chance to speak on this issue. If there is, I would have to object.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would hope not. But the gentleman might direct his inquiry to the chairman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will try to use less time than 5 minutes, but I do think we ought to look at this title II to which there has now developed some opposition on the floor on the part of some of my colleagues.

Let me remind the House that title I is simply a continuation of a program that this Congress has already enacted. Do you know who administers title I that these men who are speaking now in favor of knocking out title II have no objection to? It is the Department of HEW—and yet they have no objection to title I. They say "let HEW administer it" and they are not worried about any control of title I.

Title II which sets up a private nonprofit corporation with no Government control, HEW has nothing to do with it. The bill takes it out of the HEW Department and puts it in a nonprofit private corporation, just as the gentleman from Illinois explained. So that we will not have any Government control. I would not be here on the floor of this House supporting a bill to give any governmental control over television programming.

I can assure you of that. This committee has put in safeguards so that this cannot happen.

First, we are taking it out of HEW so that there cannot be, in the remotest way, any control by the Department.

Second, the local television station—and it is in the law—need not accept any program they do not want. The local station is the one that will decide its own programming.

Third, the bill does not allow this corporation to own a station, own a network, or own any production facilities.

And do you know who supports this bill? The TV industry itself. Do you think the networks of this country would be here supporting a bill which would allow a governmental TV network to be set up? Of course they would not.

Do you know how many witnesses before the committee offered any objection to this title? One out of 80. We did not have an onrushing of Governors here to say, "Oh, we are afraid of this," or the public, "Oh, we are afraid of this." We had 80 witnesses.

Do you know how long this committee heard testimony on this bill? Three weeks. Anyone in America had time to come here and tell us he was concerned if he had desired to do so.

What the committee has done is to put in all the safeguards, and we added one for the benefit of the Members of the House and for the Congress. That is, we are not going to let this proceed except for 1 year so the Congress can be shown. For 1 year we allow the corporation to be set up, and we limit the funds to \$9 million. They must come back to this Congress, to our committee, and, before anything else is done, this Congress would say, "Well, we do not like the way it is working," if by chance something did happen. But I feel that the committee has put in the safeguards.

It will be an advance for the young people of America and for all the people of our country to improve educational TV and cultural programs that we can see on TV. The networks themselves say it is something that ought to be done that they cannot do. I tell you that if the industry of this country supports it, if all but one of the witnesses support it, and if the majority of this committee support it, I would submit that it is worthy of your consideration, that it is not going to be a governmental-controlled thing, but rather we have assured the independence of this program as I have outlined.

I urge you to vote against this amendment.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the stated purpose of title II is a method of obtaining more funds for more and better program material for educational television in the country. We foresee much of the program production being done by the individual stations themselves. However, this is not the point that I shall dwell on.

What does concern me, contrary to the feelings of the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia, the chairman of our committee, I am disturbed over how these funds will be provided sometime in the future. I am disturbed over the cloudy picture that was presented to us by the many witnesses that did come before the committee and testified as to how the future financing of the Corporation would be achieved.

The bill calls for 1 year of financing, \$9 million for title II. Then we will decide some time in the future how those funds would be provided. What will be the sources of those funds? Where will they come from?

I feel that the committee should go into that question now. That is why I am going to support the amendment which would strike title II, in the hope

that, should the amendment be adopted, and since we will still be in session this fall, the committee could then go into any plan of financing and come up with a plan that would be presented to this House. Only by this method can we hope to have a clear picture of where we are going in the future.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from North Carolina for yielding. I hope we can clarify one point. My good friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS]—and he is a dear friend of mine—just plowed the same ground that was plowed earlier when he said he had no trouble with the present program of Federal assistance to educational television. But I hope the House will remember that nothing in the present program provides any assistance to the local stations for programing. Certainly we had no problem, and we shall not, if we continue this in its present form.

Another problem raised by my good friends from Massachusetts and Florida was that title II of this is non-controversial. Is it? Certainly it is governmental. We are debating it here this afternoon, when we would like to go. The President will make nominations for the 15 members of the board of directors, and the Senate will approve them. Is it governmental? Is it nongovernmental? This is added to the fact that the only money that will be in this title II for the operation of the public broadcasting corporation will be the \$9 million we put in it now. If that is nongovernmental, I would hate to see what we would have to do as a government to make it really a governmental agency.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. To conclude, Mr. Chairman, let me say we have no assurance that this legislative committee will have anything to do with the plan that may be submitted in the future for financing this corporation. This legislative committee could be bypassed in the future in the plan that is submitted, for example.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Chairman, as I understood it during our deliberations in the committee, that was the reason we limited title II to 1 year, to see who was appointed to the board of directors of this corporation, and to see what their plans were, and to get their approach as to what their idea for the future would be. They would be forced to come back to the Congress and to deal with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I do not quite follow the gentleman when he says we have no assurance that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee would be bypassed in the future.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I see no reason for turning over this responsibility to others until our committee or an appropriate com-

mittee of the House has made the determination and the decisions that should properly be made.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, what we are doing is creating the bare bones of a carcass for \$9 million, and what we will be asked for later will be \$270 million worth of meat to put on it in future years. I happen to be in the newspaper business in real life, and I cannot see why we cannot have Federal help to develop in-depth background stories, or Federal help to make motion pictures on public issues, or perhaps money to subsidize writers to write plays on the great movements of our day.

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the debate on this amendment has limited itself to title II. I would like at the moment to call attention of the members to title III. I have discussed this with some of my colleagues on each side of the aisle who are on the committee—and I do not question their good intentions—but if we read title II on page 34, we find it provides that this Corporation is authorized to obtain grants from the Federal Government, then if you will read title III you will see that such section, along with other provisions provides as follows, and I quote:

SEC. 301. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to conduct, directly or by contract, and in consultation with other interested Federal agencies, a study of instructional television, including its relationship to educational television broadcasting and such other aspects thereof as may assist in determining whether Federal aid should be provided therefor and the form that aid should take, and which may aid communities, institutions, or agencies in determining whether and to what extent such activities should be used.

CONTENT OF STUDY

SEC. 302. Such study shall be comprehensive in nature.

Now, notwithstanding the good intentions of members of the committee this will set in motion the probability of control of educational television programs by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. While such provision does not here enable that Department to directly control programs, in my judgment it could, and I think would, lead to control by indirection.

In other words, this would set up HEW to study the programs to determine or to help us determine whether grants should be made. Then title II provides that this corporation will be one of the recipients of the grants, or might be.

In my office there came in today a complaint from a school in my district.

I know that in the education bill we prohibited busing. I know that we prohibited the Department of HEW from running the local schools of this country. We prohibited any requirement for racial balancing. Yet I can cite case after case where indications of withholding Federal funds are used until the lo-

cal school "voluntarily" offers to do or take steps toward racial balancing and in many cases for further balancing.

I have on my desk today the latest complaint. This is from a local school, where they have opened the school to members of all races, and it is integrated. The faculty is integrated, in order to try to please HEW, the school authorities have deliberately gone out and drafted people of another race to teach school in a school predominantly of a different race. This is insufficient to please HEW.

A representative of HEW, a member of a minority race has just visited this school. He says, "I cannot tell you how to run your school, but if you do not do something more to bring about a racial balance I will have to recommend that your funds be cut off."

I say to my friend from Florida, when you provide for HEW to make a study of programs with recommendations to Congress you set in motion another set of guidelines, controlling educational TV. Though I do not question the good intentions of my friend from Florida, a reading of the bill clearly leads to setting up another set of guidelines for HEW to operate not only the schools but also the educational programs carried on TV.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I went into this question very thoroughly during the hearings of 3 weeks, to make sure this is not so. I can assure the gentleman the fact that title III says the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is going to make a study will not result that way. If the gentleman will read on, he will see that study simply is to come to the Congress.

This does not incorporate any guidelines or anything. If the gentleman will permit, we have taken title II out of HEW entirely.

Mr. WHITTEN. Let me answer the gentleman's first statement.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Very well.

Mr. WHITTEN. Is that not exactly what we did in the education bills? We did exactly what is done here, and they paid exactly no attention, and they will pay no attention to this here. Though, of course, there are some individuals at the national level who try to help, at the local level they put on pressure for racial balance.

Answer this question: Is there any distinction between your hearings and your assurances from those which we got on the education bills? Did not the Education Committee have the same hearings and receive the same assurances? We wrote prohibitions into that law, prohibitions you do not have here.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. If the gentleman will permit, there is no comparison. The gentleman is entirely incorrect in trying to draw some analogy, because the administration of title II does not even come through HEW. The Department cannot say anything. This is to be done by a private nonprofit corporation, and that is the only way a local station can get any funds. They do not go to HEW. The gentleman is wrong.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I ask the gentleman to read sections 301 and 302. I then point out that on page 34 you clearly say that the corporation may receive grants from the Federal Government. Section 301 and 302 calls on HEW to study programs and to recommend terms and conditions on which grants may be made.

Time will prove I am right—you are here beginning not only the possibility but the likelihood of Federal brainwashing. Like other things it will develop step by step. This is the first step toward such a result by television.

I think this is an exact parallel to what has happened to our schools. As long as sections 301 and 302 remain in the bill it should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

For what purpose does the gentleman from West Virginia rise?

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to see if we can get a time limitation.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet, seeking recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not see the gentleman from Michigan, but did see the gentleman from West Virginia, the chairman of the committee, on his feet.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I observe there are two Members on their feet. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment be limited to 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, certainly the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY], ought to have 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I agree. I saw only two Members at the time. Three are now standing.

I change my request to 15 minutes. That would give each Member 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, it was said here during the course of debate that the big television networks were for this bill. It has also been said that all witnesses but one were for this bill. Somehow, no one pointed out who this one witness was or how significant this witness was who opposed the bill. I refer here to the testimony of the president of the All Channel TV Society, found on page 688 of our House hearings. This society should have some meaning to the Members of the House, because the members of the All Channel TV Society are the people we put in business back in 1962 when we passed the All Channel Act in that year. These are the UHF operators to whom we said, "Go out and invest your money; put \$1 million or \$2 million or \$3 million in that UHF station and we will give you a channel." Mr. Stevens came before our committee and he pleaded for more time. He pointed out the study of the industry experts showed it would take these channels at

least 7 years to be on a par with the other stations. He pleaded to have at least until 1971 for the members of this society so that they could better compete against the subsidized programming of the educational TV stations, also UHF stations by the Federal Government. These are the people, the educational TV stations, not the big networks, that the all channel stations are competing against. They are the ones who are pleading for time. They are the ones this Congress appears so willing to ignore at this moment although we put them in business by the 1962 Act.

Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate what I said earlier about the method of financing. Both the majority and the minority views show that the Carnegie Commission objected and strongly disapproved of the appropriation method of financing because of the political influence connected with it. The Ford Foundation people, Mr. Bundy and Mr. Friendly, well known personalities, objected to the appropriation process method of financing. We ought to consider those views.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I would say it is true this is only a \$9 million title II this year, but it will be \$90 million next year and will again be financed by the appropriation process because I am convinced that is what appears to be what a majority here would like to have.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. Is it not true that these people who testified in favor—and I reviewed the list of witnesses who appeared before the committee, such as the State University Associations and the educational TV networks in being, plus the land-grant colleges—are those who would naturally be in favor of an additional subsidized Federal program? This is their meat and their bread.

Mr. HARVEY. There is no question but that it is true there is a dearth of programming in educational TV. But the best thing going for programming under title II is the dearth of good programming on commercial TV as well. Because Americans are dissatisfied with present commercial programs does not mean the Federal Government should step in and create a subsidized programming. I do not think so, and neither did these people who run the all channel stations. If the Federal Government finances it, it ought to do it with a specific tax. The Carnegie Commission recommended an excise tax on the sale of television sets. The Ford Foundation recommended a tax on the satellites. Even the minority member of the Carnegie Commission recommended a specific tax on the TV stations. None of them said come in and take it out of the general fund. In fact they said just the opposite. I cannot help but think, Mr. Chairman, when I read today that the expenses of the Federal Government have grown 341 percent in the last 20 years since 1947, it is something for us to reflect on, because our population has only grown 37 percent during that period of time. It is obvious that with Government growing this fast, it is not growing

to serve the needs of our people—but to serve itself. The motion to strike title II should be supported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

(Mr. COLLIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier—and I will repeat it at this time—the House Committee on Ways and Means has been struggling for days now to try to find a way to partially meet the astronomical Federal deficit. Every Member of this House is going to be faced with having to vote for a tax increase. By the end of this fiscal year—and I repeat this because apparently it does not sink in—we are going to be at least \$29 billion more in debt. This is certainly no time to embark upon a new program, a new program that, No. 1, is not needed and, No. 2, no one knows how it is going to be financed. And, let me tell you something else. This afternoon I called the manager of one of the largest TV stations in the country, and I queried him as to the ratio of cost of operations of the average television station—the physical facilities and maintenance on the one hand—and the product and the program on the other. He said that between 65 and 70 percent of the total cost is put into programming and product.

Now, Mr. Chairman, project, if you will, what has been spent for facilities in 137 educational television stations—since the inception of this act—and you can really conclude what we are really talking about in total cost. It is time not for this House to put your head in the sand, because you know darn well that this Congress is going to have to finance this program. And it must concern itself with the fiscal mistakes that have been made and be responsible for decisions that are going to make our fiscal situation worse than it is today. And, Mr. Chairman, God knows it is already bad enough. I remind you that we are going to have a tax bill to vote on. It seems to me that fiscal responsibility dictates today that if ever there was a time for introducing and for underwriting a new program, a program that we do not know what it is going to produce and cost, it is certainly not at this time. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I say that the Congress of the United States should delay the authorization for this program at least till next year.

And, Mr. Chairman, I do want to make it clear that I favor resuming the program under title I. I have no great objection to title III, although there are some things contained therein with which I do not agree.

But I think this is not the time to act on this particular title of the bill because in my opinion good fiscal judgment demands that title II should be struck from the bill and that we should proceed accordingly, until we at least know in which direction we are traveling before embarking upon this kind of new unpredictable expensive program.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the gentleman from Illinois that one of the reasons the local ETV stations need money for programming is that much of their resources and funds have come from local taxes or resources, either through the State legislature or through the local governments or through institutions which support them, such as the various State universities.

These local ETV operators are smart enough to want to pass on a good portion of this cost to the Congress of the United States and to the taxpayers of the United States in general if we will take them over, so as to relieve their local governments and institutions from having to spend the required amount of money.

I understand their efforts to obtain their necessary operating funds through this approach—funds which are needed—but it is my opinion they ought to come from the local institutions and Governments which have received licenses for these stations in the first place and that if they can't obtain funds in this way, perhaps the local officials and taxpayers are saying, cut back your expenses and not saying get the money from us by way of Washington.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I will go one step further by telling the Members of the Committee that if instructional television—and no one respects its value any more than I do—is as vital to the public educational system as the experts say it is, then it seems to me that the State legislatures, just as they appropriate money for the general public educational system, have the responsibility to appropriate such funds at a State level as are necessary to carry out the needs of educational television.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COLLIER. I yield further to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If this program were used in carrying out the basic activities of the classroom—educational television—I would agree with the gentleman from Illinois to the effect that I think the \$9 million would be worth the undertaking. However, I feel it is aimed at an entertainment program instead.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE].

(Mr. PICKLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, permit me to say very briefly—and then I shall yield the balance of my time to our great and distinguished Speaker. There has been an established agreement all through the course of the debate during the House today that the educational television program is a good program. Primarily, what is proposed to be done under the pending legislation is that we would add a new section, a section designed to carry out and to fulfill a crying need in the programming field.

Mr. Chairman, if the members of the committee do not add this new feature to the present program, then the members of the committee are literally going to suffocate or cripple the best communi-

cations media for this type of education that the world has ever known.

Surely we are not asking too much in requesting \$9 million for the purpose of carrying out plans for improved educational programs. That is primarily what this bill provides. Surely this Congress will provide that.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKLE. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. STAGGERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Did we not in committee cut \$27 million out of the first section of this bill?

Mr. PICKLE. We did.

Mr. STAGGERS. I notice that the gentleman from North Carolina is looking this way. It was the gentleman from North Carolina who did make the motion which cut \$27 million from this bill, and certainly we know what was asked for.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, this whole bill is only \$20 million for fiscal 1968.

Mr. Chairman, I would like at this time to yield to our great and distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the very heart of this bill is title II. If title II is stricken from the bill it will have a very adverse effect upon the successful operation of this legislation if enacted into law.

Title II establishes a public corporation to encourage the production of plays, operas, and other cultural offerings which commercial networks find are not economical to produce on a sustaining basis.

It is true that while Federal funds are needed to initiate this creative approach to quality programming, the fact remains that the Corporation will be truly public.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has done everything possible to guarantee that our airways will be free from any type of Federal control or programming. Certainly that meets the argument presented by my friend from Mississippi.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to cite these safeguards. They have been repeated several times, but I will cite them again for the benefit of the Members:

First, all grants for programming will be made by an independent, private, nonprofit corporation, not the Federal Government.

Second, the board of directors and employees of this corporation will not be civil servants or employees of the Federal Government.

Third, no more than eight members of the board of directors of the corporation can be from any one political party. I thoroughly agree with my friend from Illinois, Mr. Chairman, in the able presentation he made in this respect.

Fourth, the bill specifically prohibits the corporation from owning or operating any station, system, network or program facilities, and

Fifth, local stations will have full freedom to accept or reject programs.

This is one of the best-considered bills I have ever seen, that has ever come out of any committee.

Title II is of vital importance if this bill is to be successful.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the amendment to strike out title II.

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers, Mr. WATSON and Mr. STAGGERS.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 111, noes 120.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF MISSOURI

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: On page 20, line 14, strike out "\$10,500,000" and the balance of line 14, and all of lines 15, 16, and 17, and substitute the following: "not to exceed \$10,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; not to exceed \$12,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and not to exceed \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; said appropriations to be limited to the total amount of funds collected in the form of licenses and fees assessed and collected from commercial radio and television stations by the Federal Communications Commission, and converted to the U.S. Treasury; said schedule of fees being set by the Federal Communications Commission, after an appropriate study, and approved by the Commerce Committee of the U.S. Senate and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we have been hearing a lot about the cost of this bill. This amendment would provide for the cost to be paid by someone other than the taxpayers. In other words, the amendment would provide for the payments to be made from licenses and fees assessed by the Federal Communications Commission after approval of the schedule of fees by the Commerce Committee of the Senate and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives.

Why do I bring this amendment to your attention at this time?

First, very few people recognize the value of the license that we have given to the television stations of this country. Almost without exception the license itself is worth many times more than the physical assets of the station. Television and radio stations alike—and I have been in the radio business for about 20 years and got out of it last year—have been profitable businesses. They should have been paying a license fee for the exclusive use of the airwaves, the channels that the television stations have, and the frequencies assigned to radio stations. I have been advocating this for years, even when I was a major stockholder in a radio station, which interest I sold last year.

We give a television station an exclusive channel from which the owners of that station make many millions of dollars each year. They pay nothing for that. No one can compete with them. So this offers an opportunity to let one segment of the industry which will profit from this education bill pay a part of the cost.

Why do I say that the commercial stations will benefit by this bill? The educational stations will carry a lot of the public service that is now being carried by some of the commercial stations but in a limited amount. These people can afford to pay this money as evidenced by the fact that CBS has already volunteered that they would be willing to contribute \$1 million to the cost of this program. One million per station, per year, of the stations owned by the three large networks would be a more realistic contribution.

Despite what the gentleman from Texas said a minute ago, when he spoke about a \$20-million bill, if I can add the figures in the cost of this bill here for the next 3 years, it will be \$48,500,000. It has been said by members of the committee on the floor that the cost of this program may reach to more than \$400 million a year to be paid by the taxpayers, when you have this other source which you could tap, and which would not bring about any loss, I would say, to the stations that are making tremendous profits and which could pay for this out of their profits. I will hear from a lot of my friends who operate small local radio stations, but I can assure them that under no stretch of the imagination would they be assessed any appreciable amount if the cost is apportioned on an equitable basis with the larger TV stations bearing most of the cost, since they are the one who profit most and should bear most of the burden.

That is all I have to say about it. We are trying to conserve money in this administration—or at least some of us are. Here is an opportunity to save not only \$48 million at this time, but to save throughout the years Federal money that will go into operating stations. We will save that. This could go into billions of dollars that could be saved if we do something that should have been done years ago, collecting for the licenses that the television and radio stations should be paying.

(Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I would like to say to the committee that if I could have heard the amendment I would have raised a point of its not being germane to the bill. It is not germane to the bill. It is a new method of financing never considered by the committee.

I urge rejection of the amendment because I just do not believe it comes at the proper time or place.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from West Virginia. I believe we

should vote down this amendment, and if we need to go into the future financing, we can do it in the committee. A number of proposals have been brought forward. I am not clear in my own mind exactly what this amendment would or would not do. I hope the amendment of the gentleman will be defeated, and we can consider it later in the form of legislation or amendment to this program at a later date.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, may I say to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri that he has done some careful and good thinking on this question. To some extent I agree with him and what he said today, because I know he has been in the business and he knows the problems of this business. I believe the fraternity of broadcasting probably ought to be contributing more than it does, and for this I commend him.

I just do have a certain hesitation in accepting this amendment now. I do not fully understand it. Next year we are going to go into many more of these problems, and I think at that time we should go into the question of financing. It is with that reservation that I urge the amendment not be adopted.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee and the gentlemen, when they look at this question of financing next year as stated will look into the point that the national networks and commentators are not only not liable, but they are using nationwide network documentaries and commentaries. I believe it may be that this escape from the libel suits alone, would pay all the fees that are necessary. Furthermore, I think we might well test this and see how anxious to pay for this are these people, from the various networks who are coming in to testify in favor of it.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman has discussed this before. I would be glad to have the gentleman appear before the committee on this.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman. I shall avail myself of this opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I want to see how many people want to save a little money, so I demand a division on that.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES of Missouri) there were—ayes 25, noes 104.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF OHIO

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. Brown of Ohio: On page 28, line 14, strike out "including" and insert in lieu thereof "in particular".

On page 28, line 17, after "educational" insert "and instructional".

On page 28, line 22, after "educational" insert "and instructional".

On page 29, line 2, after "educational" insert "and instructional".

On page 29, line 10, after "educational" insert "and instructional".

On page 29, line 13, after "educational" insert "and instructional".

On page 33, line 10, after "educational" insert "and instructional".

On page 33, line 18, after "educational" insert "and instructional".

On page 34, line 17, after "educational" insert "and instructional".

On page 34, line 22, after "educational" insert "and instructional".

On page 35, line 1, after "educational" insert "and instructional".

On page 35, line 4, after "educational" insert "and instructional".

On page 35, line 9, after "educational" insert "and instructional".

On page 35, line 22, after "educational" insert "and instructional".

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendments is to see that the public corporation established by title II is instructed by this legislation to include and lay emphasis on instructional television as differentiated from mere educational television.

Let me explain the kind of problem the committee got into in this whole field.

Educational television, and now educational radio, originally was designed to bring education into the classroom and the home. It was not designed as an entertainment medium or the British Broadcasting kind of approach, or to bring other programing and cultural uplift to the homes of the Nation in competition with the private television networks and stations.

So the meaning of these amendments is to try to return to that original purpose in this legislation, to see that the funds allocated under title II, \$9 million, are used to develop programing in the instructional area.

The ambition of this is to save the American taxpayer some dollars in his public and private educational expenses; in other words, to provide, where possible, that television can be used in classroom lectures, and to teach people at home how to do woodworking or how to garden or to shop effectively, or to instruct them in other areas of public responsibility and personal interest, and not just the entertainment or cultural approaches that have been suggested by some of the people who appeared before our committee.

There are no particular "hookers" in this amendment. If the Members believe educational television should be instructional television for both classroom and the home, they will support this amendment. If they believe it ought to be an entertainment medium in competition with present radio and television networks and stations, I suppose they will vote against the amendment.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the 5 minutes. I will say this amendment was proposed in the committee and voted down by a majority of the committee. It was discussed very thoroughly there. We are authorizing money for a study to see how instructional television should be

done. I oppose the amendment now. It was defeated in the committee, and I think it ought to be defeated now.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAGGERS. I will be glad to yield. Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is it the chairman's thought that we should move away from instructional TV?

Mr. STAGGERS. No. That is not my intention. This is not the proper time for this amendment. It was voted down in the committee. We have a study set up in title III for this purpose.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. We are now in the instructional television business, are we not, in television?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This will help to keep us there.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

The amendments were rejected.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see if we could set some time for the completion of the bill. I understand there are two amendments yet to be offered. I wonder if we could set a time when we can finish this. There are a lot of Members who want to go home and who have different commitments.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to limit debate on the committee substitute and all amendments thereto to 6 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. That is a pretty poor excuse to adjourn, because some people want to get away from here. We came here to legislate, and they want to cut us off at 6 o'clock.

Mr. STAGGERS. I am not trying to cut you off or anybody else. If you have something to say, you can be recognized at any time.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am not talking about that, but I am saying you are trying to rush a bill like this through. A bill of this importance needs some discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

(Mr. CAREY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify my interpretation of certain provisions of title II of H.R. 6736.

It is my understanding that, in addition to grants and contracts for program development, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting can grant funds for the operation of noncommercial broadcasting stations licensed by the Federal Communications Commission. If a school system operates such a station, it can receive such grants, and the programs

broadcast by the school station can be received by any one, or any other school, in the service area of the station, having a television receiver. So all children, in all schools, public and private, will be able to see and use the programs broadcast as a result of Corporation support.

Many educational TV stations today provide program service to the private schools and the public schools, and, under the bill, it is my understanding that such service could continue, and in fact, be expanded through operating grants from the Corporation to the stations.

I also understand that the Corporation will not provide operational support for closed circuit or fixed-service television systems in schools since they are not noncommercial educational broadcasting stations licensed by the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise after a prearrangement with the chairman of the committee. As important as this bill is for all adults, it is even more important for children. Fifty million youngsters in our country watch television an average of 4 hours a day. We have distinguished reports which have shown that the commercial networks are not meeting the challenge in the area of children's programing. As the father of five who are 9 years of age and under, I can tell you that television for children is a mini-wasteland. Newsweek magazine recently estimated on Saturday mornings the three networks programed 23½ hours of cartoons. I can assure you most of them are dull and kooky. The Carnegie report urges that public television devote special attention to the informal educational needs of preschoolchildren and to the supplementary educational needs of school age children.

I brought this amendment to the committee. It was turned down there. And for the purpose of legislative history, I wonder if the chairman can tell us what the corporation plans to do on programing for high-quality children's programs?

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. STAGGERS. I will say to the gentleman from New York that the committee felt we should not set any guidelines on what the money should be used for in the way of programing.

We did say in the bill that programs should have objectivity and balance.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBERSTEIN].

(Mr. FARBERSTEIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FARBERSTEIN

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FARBERSTEIN: On page 29, after line 16 insert "(7) That in view of the privileges granted by the United States Government to commercial broadcasters of radio and television the aforesaid grantees of licenses should con-

tribute substantially to the construction and maintenance by nonprofit corporations of public educational broadcasting. The Federal Communications Commission shall make a study of the charges to be levied against the commercial broadcasters of radio and television and advise the two Houses of Congress of their findings.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. Under the declaration of policy contained in this legislation it adds a statement to the effect that commercial television and commercial radio shall pay a portion of the cost of educational television; that they shall contribute to the cost of educational television and educational radio.

Mr. Chairman, the second portion of the declaration of policy is to the effect that the Federal Communications Commission shall make a study to determine how much shall be paid by commercial television and radio corporations toward the construction and maintenance of educational television and radio.

It is a very simple declaration of policy. I do not say that there is any contribution stated to be provided for in the amendment. I only ask for a study to be made. The amendment which I have offered also provides that we should be clear at this time to the effect that there is an obligation on the part of commercial broadcasting television and radio to the effect that they should contribute toward the cost of educational television and radio.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment for the same reason as I rose in opposition to the other amendment that was presented. We have had no testimony presented to the committee on this matter. We have had no opportunity to inquire into the subject. Therefore, we do not wish to be tied down to the particular study now suggested. The committee should be free to study all different types of financing proposals.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the distinguished gentleman from New York that the gentleman showed me his amendment and, perhaps, I did state to the gentleman that there was some merit in his thinking on this, because it does represent something into which we ought to go. But I would hesitate to undertake to establish a policy and to determine what share of these costs the various interests involved should pay. They have a right to receive what is reasonable and to pay what is reasonable under the provisions of the act. However, this is a matter that should be gone into in depth. So, I think that the gentleman is assuming in the second part of the declaration a matter into which the committee has not as yet gone.

Therefore, I hope that the gentleman from New York would come before our committee next year and bring our attention to some of these matters, matters which are similar to the same things to which the gentleman from Missouri has made reference. I do not feel that we can afford to establish such a policy here at this late period of time during debate.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Good intentions, unfortunately, are evident on every hand. Yet, when a proposal appears on the floor of the House and we make a determination thereon, you know what is done. However, when you start delaying—and I have had this experience over the years—you never get anywhere because of the very philosophy which is involved here. There is inherently involved a principle that the stations should contribute to the cost of educational television.

And then they say "let the Federal Communications Commission make a study to determine how much they should contribute." I do not know what there is to going into any study in depth by the Commission, because they eventually will go into this. What there is against the proposal I cannot understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I believe this amendment should be adopted. I believe the amendment I offered should have been adopted. They said that was going too far. All Mr. FARBSTEIN is asking is to give us a study, after indicating that Congress does believe that a licensee fee is equitable and desirable.

I will tell you what: I have been up here almost 19 years. When I came up here, I first went to the Federal Communications Commission to find out what was wrong with asking radio stations and television stations to pay a license fee. I found about two that were in favor of it, and the rest of them were against it. I went to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the chairman and on down, and talked to the members. I found that the longer they have been on there, the more opposed they are to doing anything to change the status quo.

I am telling you folks something is rotten in Denmark because television stations and radio stations should be paying a fee, but you are never going to get a bill out of this Committee on that, you are going to have to vote for it on this floor. If you vote for this proposal that Congress says that this is their considered policy, then you can at least make a start. That is all we are asking now to declare: that we believe these people should pay for something. I believe the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Yes; I yield.

Mr. STAGGERS. Did the gentleman ever come to me about this proposition?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No; I have not talked to you recently.

Mr. STAGGERS. Did the gentleman talk to Mr. MACDONALD on this?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I have not talked to him recently.

Mr. STAGGERS. Or Mr. FRIEDEL.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Yes; I have talked to him.

Mr. STAGGERS. Has the gentleman talked to Mr. SPRINGER?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Yes; I have talked to Mr. SPRINGER.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. FRIEDEL says the gentleman has not talked to him about it.

Mr. FRIEDEL. No; the gentleman has not.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. SAM, you are a very forgetful man.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FARBSTEIN) there were—ayes 57, noes 93.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask for the attention of the chairman of the committee and also the chairman of the Subcommittee on Communications and Power.

There are just two or three questions I would want to ask concerning some of the language in the bill to reinforce some of the interpretation I have of the bill.

Members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce know that I have expressed concern in the committee over actual or implied powers of the Public Broadcasting Corporation to maintain a full-time interconnection system over which regularly scheduled programs could be transmitted.

There is language in the bill as well as in the report, which deals with this situation. As I interpret this language, if any interconnection facilities are provided to an individual educational broadcasting station then some nonprofit agency or organization would have to make these interconnection arrangements.

I want to call the attention of the committee to page 355, section (E). This section deals with the authorized activities of the corporation.

This section states that if any grants or any contracts for interconnection purposes are made, they must be made through public or nonprofit private agencies or organizations.

To reinforce this interpretation, I would also call the attention of the committee to language on page 36, subsection (h) which authorizes free or reduced rate interconnection service.

This section does not authorize power to the Corporation to maintain an interconnection service at reduced rates. This section would attempt to give reduced or free rates to "grantees of, or contractors with the Corporation."

I would also call the attention of the committee to the report on page 19 which states that the Corporation will not have ownership or operative authority over interconnection facilities. As I read all this language, this reinforces my interpretation of this language and as I see it, the Corporation is prohibited from contracting directly with the A.T. & T. or any other communications common carriers for a leased line for dissemination of program material.

Would the gentleman agree with this interpretation?

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. I would agree. I would point out to the gentleman that I think this is a mistake.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time for debate has been limited.

(Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for attempting to obtain extra time for me.

In view of the limitation of time on debate, I regret that a full discussion of these questions is not possible. I would call attention of the House to section 396(g)(1)(B) on page 33 of the bill. This language authorizes the Corporation to assist in the establishment and development of a system of interconnection. Also the section following (c), accomplishes the same purpose. There is some doubt by Members as to the proper interpretation of these sections and their relation to the other sections mentioned.

Another question which arises is the full meaning of section 396(g)(2)(B) on page 34. Here the Corporation is authorized to contract for and make grants for the production of program material. This together with language on page 36, section 396(g)(3), apparently would prohibit the Corporation from—among other things—owning or operating program production facilities. There is also a section in the committee report dealing with this matter on page 19. I would be of the opinion that this combined language definitely prohibits the Corporation from maintaining a staff of producers, commentators, announcers, and others directly associated with program production. It is my hope and desire that sufficient safeguards have been built into this legislation, but it is my feeling that only time will tell.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON].

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to take this time to express my wholehearted support of the motion to recommit which I understand the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] will offer at the appropriate time.

As I understand this motion, it will include the amendment that a number of us tried to pass in deleting title II or eliminating the so-called broadcasting corporation for which there is no definite means of financing.

The only information we have is that the cost will probably amount one day to \$270 million, and it is probable that the taxpayers are going to have to pay that.

Second, and I think this is most important, many have expressed concern about the lack of money for programming at the local level.

Granted, under title I, that the money only goes for facilities and/or equipment, while in the motion to recommit there will also be a provision to give \$5 million or add \$5 million to title I to be distributed equally to all of the local ETV stations in existence at the time of the passage of this act to be used specifically for programming purposes.

If you genuinely want to help your stations build up their facilities and their equipment and programs, you will support this motion to recommit.

If you just want to go out and create in the blind this monster of a public broadcasting corporation which will ultimately control your local TV and be in competition with your local TV stations, then you will oppose the motion to recommit.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WATSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Under the motion to recommit, do I understand that provision is made that \$5 million made available would be distributed equally to all the ETV stations now on the line for program development purposes?

Mr. WATSON. The gentleman is absolutely correct; that is, those in existence at the time of the passage of this act.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. So every educational TV and radio station in the country will get some money for programming under this motion to recommit?

Mr. WATSON. There is no question about it. It will be a tremendous help to the local TV stations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE].

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely to explain to the House what the motion to recommit will contain, the one that I expect to offer at the appropriate time. This motion to recommit would strike from the bill title II. This, of course, was the subject of an amendment that failed by a very few votes earlier this afternoon.

In addition, the motion would provide the sum of \$5 million to be distributed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for programming purposes only, and this sum would be distributed to those educational radio stations and television stations that are in the educational field, in existence at the time of the effective date of the bill that we are acting on today. It is just that simple.

For those of you who feel that you have an economy problem, it will save you \$4 million of the \$9 million provided in the bill as now constituted, and yet it will provide money for all existing TV and radio stations.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVINE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As I understand,

the motion to recommit will provide for those stations to spend that money any way they wish. They may use it to develop their own resources, to make a program or to buy a program that someone else has developed.

Mr. DEVINE. They have the assurance that they will get some money.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And they could pool it if they wanted to in one State?

Mr. DEVINE. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GALLAGHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6736) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 920, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee substitute amendment? If not, the question is on the committee substitute amendment.

The committee substitute amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DEVINE. I am in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DEVINE moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 6736, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with instructions to report the bill back forthwith with an amendment as follows: On page 25, after line 19, insert the following:

"GRANTS TO EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING STATIONS

"SEC. 107. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, \$5,000,000 which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall

divide equally and distribute among educational broadcasting stations in the United States which are in existence on the date of enactment of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967"

Strike out all of title II.

Redesignate title III and title II and sections 301, 302, 303, and 304, as sections 201, 202, 203, and 204, respectively.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 167, nays 194, not voting 71, as follows:

[Roll No. 270]

YEAS—167

Abbott	Gardner	Pool
Abnerthy	Gathings	Price, Tex.
Adair	Goodell	Railsback
Andrews, Ala.	Gooding	Randall
Arends	Gross	Reid, Ill.
Ashbrook	Gubser	Reifel
Ashmore	Gude	Reinecke
Ayres	Gurney	Rhodes, Ariz.
Battin	Hagan	Riegle
Bell	Haley	Rivers
Berry	Hall	Robison
Betts	Hammer-	Roth
Blester	Schmidt	Roudebush
Bolton	Hansen, Idaho	Satterfield
Bow	Hardy	Saylor
Bray	Harsha	Schadeberg
Brock	Harvey	Scherie
Brown, Ohio	Henderson	Schneebeli
Broyhill, N.C.	Hosmer	Schweiker
Broyhill, Va.	Hull	Schwengel
Buchanan	Hunt	Scott
Burke, Fla.	Johnson, Pa.	Selden
Burleson	Jonas	Shriver
Burton, Utah	Jones, Mo.	Sikes
Bush	Jones, N.C.	Smith, Calif.
Byrnes, Wis.	King, N.Y.	Smith, N.Y.
Cabell	Kleppe	Smith, Okla.
Cahill	Kuykendall	Snyder
Carter	Kyl	Stanton
Casey	Laird	Steiger, Ariz.
Chamberlain	Landrum	Steiger, Wis.
Clancy	Langen	Stuckey
Clausen	Lennon	Talcoff
Don H.	Lippscomb	Taylor
Clawson, Del.	Lloyd	Teague, Calif.
Collier	Lukens	Teague, Tex.
Colmer	McClure	Thompson, Ga.
Conable	McCulloch	Thompson, Wis.
Cowger	McDade	Tuck
Curtis	McDonald,	Vander Jagt
Davis, Wis.	Mich.	Waggonner
Dellenback	McEwen	Wampler
Devine	McMillan	Watson
Dickinson	MacGregor	Watts
Dole	Marsh	Whalen
Dowdy	Martin	Whalley
Downing	May	White
Duncan	Mayne	Whitener
Dwyer	Meskill	Whitten
Edwards, Ala.	Michel	Widnall
Erlenborn	Miller, Ohio	Wiggins
Eshleman	Mize	Williams, Miss.
Fisher	Nichols	Winn
Flynt	O'Konski	Wydler
Ford, Gerald R.	O'Neal, Ga.	Wylie
Frelinghuysen	Passman	Zion
Fulton, Pa.	Poff	

NAYS—194

Addabbo	Boland	Davis, Ga.
Albert	Bolling	Delaney
Anderson, Ill.	Brademas	Denney
Anderson,	Brasco	Diggs
Tenn.	Brooks	Donohue
Andrews,	Brotzman	Dorn
N. Dak.	Burke, Mass.	Dulski
Annunzio	Burton, Calif.	Eckhardt
Ashley	Byrne, Pa.	Edwards, La.
Barrett	Carey	Ellberg
Bates	Clark	Esch
Bennett	Cleveland	Evans, Colo.
Bevill	Cohelan	Everett
Bingham	Culver	Evins, Tenn.
Blanton	Cunningham	Farbstein
Blatnik	Daddario	Fascell
Boggs	Daniels	Flood

Foley	Kupferman	Quile
Ford,	Kyros	Rees
William D.	Long, Md.	Reid, N.Y.
Fraser	McCarthy	Resnick
Friedel	McClary	Reuss
Fulton, Tenn.	McFall	Roberts
Fuqua	Macdonald,	Rodino
Galifianakis	Mass.	Rogers, Colo.
Gallagher	Machen	Rogers, Fla.
Gettys	Madden	Ronan
Gialmo	Mahon	Rooney, N.Y.
Gibbons	Mailliard	Rooney, Pa.
Gilbert	Matsunaga	Rosenthal
Gonzalez	Meeds	Rostenkowski
Gray	Miller, Calif.	Roush
Green, Oreg.	Minish	Roybal
Green, Pa.	Mink	Rumsfeld
Griffiths	Monagan	Ryan
Grover	Montgomery	St Germain
Halleck	Moore	St. Onge
Halpern	Moorhead	Sandman
Hanley	Morgan	Sisk
Hanna	Morris, N. Mex.	Skubitz
Hansen, Wash.	Morse, Mass.	Slack
Hathaway	Morton	Smith, Iowa
Hawkins	Mosher	Springer
Hechler, W. Va.	Multer	Staggers
Heckler, Mass.	Murphy, Ill.	Steed
Helstoski	Myers	Stephens
Hicks	Natcher	Stratton
Holifield	Nedzi	Stubblefield
Howard	Nix	Sullivan
Hungate	O'Hara, Ill.	Thompson, N.J.
Ichord	O'Hara, Mich.	Tierman
Irwin	Olsen	Tunney
Jacobs	O'Neill, Mass.	Ullman
Jarman	Ottinger	Van Deerlin
Joelson	Patman	Vanik
Johnson, Calif.	Patten	Vigorito
Jones, Ala.	Felly	Walker
Karsten	Pepper	Wilson, Bob
Karsh	Perkins	Wilson,
Kastenmeier	Pettis	Charles H.
Kazen	Philbin	Wright
Kee	Pickle	Wyman
Keith	Pike	Yates
Kelly	Pirnie	Zablocki
King, Calif.	Poage	Zwack
Kirwan	Price, Ill.	
Kornegay	Pryor	

NOT VOTING—71

Adams	Edwards, Calif.	Murphy, N.Y.
Aspinall	Fallon	Nelsen
Baring	Feighan	Pollock
Belcher	Findley	Pucinski
Blackburn	Fino	Purcell
Brinkley	Fountain	Quillen
Broomfield	Garmatz	Rarick
Brown, Calif.	Hamilton	Rhodes, Pa.
Brown, Mich.	Harrison	Ruppe
Button	Hays	Scheuer
Cederberg	Hébert	Shipley
Celler	Herlong	Stafford
Conte	Holland	Taft
Conyers	Horton	Tenzer
Corbett	Hutchinson	Udall
Corman	Kluczynski	Utt
Cramer	Latta	Waldie
Dawson	Leggett	Watkins
de la Garza	Long, La.	Williams, Pa.
Dent	Mathias, Calif.	Willis
Derwinski	Mathias, Md.	Wyatt
Dingell	Mills	Young
Dow	Minshall	
Edmondson	Moss	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Mills for, with Mr. Moss against.
 Mr. Willis for, with Mr. Kluczynski against.
 Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Wolff against.
 Mr. Long of Louisiana for, with Mr. Tenzer against.
 Mr. Fountain for, with Mr. Feighan against.
 Mr. Rarick for, with Mr. Dent against.
 Mr. Cederberg for, with Mr. Pollock against.
 Mr. Hutchinson for, with Mr. Latta against.
 Mr. Derwinski for, with Mr. Horton against.
 Mr. Blackburn for, with Mr. Button against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Celler with Mr. Nelsen.
 Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.
 Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Stafford.

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Cramer.
 Mr. Fallon with Mr. Mathias of California.
 Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Brown of Michigan.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Belcher.
 Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Utt.
 Mr. Adams with Mr. Wyatt.
 Mr. Leggett with Mr. Fino.
 Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Conte.
 Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Broomfield.
 Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Corbett.
 Mr. Young with Mr. Ruppe.
 Mr. Waldie with Mr. Williams of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Udall with Mr. Watkins.
 Mr. Brinkley with Mr. Quillen.
 Mr. Dingell with Mr. Minshall.
 Mr. Hays with Mr. Harrison.
 Mr. Herlong with Mr. Findley.
 Mr. Hamilton with Mr. Shipley.
 Mr. Purcell with Mr. Baring.
 Mr. Dow with Mr. Dawson.
 Mr. Holland with Mr. Conyers.
 Mr. Scheurer with Mr. de la Garza.

Mr. WYMAN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 265, nays 91, answered "present" 1, not voting 75, as follows:

[Roll No. 271]

YEAS—265

Adair	Eshleman	Johnson, Pa.
Addabbo	Evans, Colo.	Jonas
Albert	Everett	Jones, Ala.
Anderson, Ill.	Evins, Tenn.	Karsten
Anderson,	Farbstein	Karsh
Tenn.	Fascell	Kastenmeier
Andrews,	Fisher	Kazen
N. Dak.	Flood	Kee
Annunzio	Foley	Keith
Arends	Ford, Gerald R.	Kelly
Ashley	Ford,	King, Calif.
Ayres	William D.	Kirwan
Barrett	Fraser	Kleppe
Bates	Frelinghuysen	Kornegay
Bell	Friedel	Kupferman
Bennett	Fulton, Pa.	Kuykendall
Berry	Fulton, Tenn.	Kyl
Bevill	Fuqua	Kyros
Blester	Galifianakis	Laird
Bingham	Gallagher	Landrum
Blanton	Gettys	Lloyd
Blatnik	Gialmo	Long, Md.
Boggs	Gibbons	Lukens
Boland	Gilbert	McCarthy
Bolling	Gonzalez	McClary
Brademas	Goodell	McDade
Brasco	Goodling	McDonald,
Brooks	Gray	Mich.
Brotzman	Green, Oreg.	McEwen
Broyhill, Va.	Green, Pa.	McFall
Burke, Mass.	Griffiths	Macdonald,
Burton, Calif.	Grover	Mass.
Burton, Utah	Halleck	MacGregor
Bush	Halpern	Machen
Byrne, Pa.	Hammer-	Madden
Cahill	Schmidt	Mahon
Carey	Hanley	Mailliard
Carter	Hanna	Martin
Clark	Hansen, Wash.	Matsunaga
Cleveland	Hardy	May
Cohelan	Harsha	Mayne
Conable	Hathaway	Meeds
Culver	Hawkins	Meskill
Cunningham	Hechler, W. Va.	Miller, Calif.
Daddario	Heckler, Mass.	Miller, Ohio
Daniels	Helstoski	Minish
Davis, Ga.	Hicks	Mink
Delaney	Holifield	Mize
Denney	Howard	Monagan
Dorn	Hungate	Montgomery
Dulski	Hunt	Moore
Eckhardt	Ichord	Morgan
Edwards, La.	Irwin	Morris, N. Mex.
Ellberg	Jacobs	Morse, Mass.
Esch	Jarman	Morton
Evans, Colo.	Joelson	Mosher
Everett	Johnson, Calif.	Murphy, Ill.

Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price, Ill.
Quie
Railsback
Randall
Rees
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Resnick
Reuss

Riegle
Robison
Roder
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Sandman
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scheuer
Schneebell
Schweiker
Schwengel
Selden
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.

Springer
Staggers
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tunney
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watts
Whalen
Whalley
Whitnall
Wilson, Bob
Wilson,
Charles H.
Wright
Wyllie
Wyman
Yates
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—91

Abbitt
Abernethy
Andrews, Ala.
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Battin
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brock
Brown, Ohio
Broyles, N.C.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burleson
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Casey
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen,
Don H.
Clawson, Del.
Collier
Colmer
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Devine
Dole

Dowdy
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Erlenborn
Flynt
Gardner
Gathings
Gross
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Hansen, Idaho
Harvey
Henderson
Hosmer
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
King, N.Y.
Langen
Lennon
Lipscomb
McClure
McCulloch
McMillan
Marsh
Michel
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman

Price, Tex.
Pryor
Reid, Ill.
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers
Roberts
Roudebush
Satterfield
Scherle
Scott
Smith, Calif.
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Stuckey
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Tuck
Waggoner
Watson
White
Whitener
Whitten
Wiggins
Williams, Miss.
Winn

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Ullman

NOT VOTING—75

Adams
Aspinall
Baring
Belcher
Blackburn
Brinkley
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Button
Cederberg
Celler
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Cowger
Cramer
Dawson
de la Garza
Dent
Derwinski
Dingell
Dow
Dulski

Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Ellberg
Fallon
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fountain
Garmatz
Hamilton
Harrison
Hays
Hébert
Herlong
Holland
Horton
Hutchinson
Kluczynski
Latta
Leggett
Long, La.
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Mills
Minshall

Moss
Multer
Murphy, N.Y.
Nelsen
Pollock
Pucinski
Purcell
Quillen
Rarick
Rhodes, Pa.
Ruppe
Shipley
Snyder
Stafford
Taft
Tenzer
Udall
Utt
Watkins
Williams, Pa.
Willis
Wolff
Wyatt
Wydler
Young

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Moss for, with Mr. Ullman against.
Mr. Multer for, with Mr. Mills against.

Mr. Dent for, with Mr. Hébert against.
Mr. Shipley for, with Mr. Long of Louisiana against.

Mr. Dulski for, with Mr. Fountain against.
Mr. Leggett for, with Mr. Rarick against.
Mr. Wolff for, with Mr. Willis against.
Mr. Stafford for, with Mr. Blackburn against.
Mr. Horton for, with Mr. Derwinski against.
Mr. Corbett for, with Mr. Hutchinson against.

Mr. Fino for, with Mr. Cederberg against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Adams with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Latta.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Minshall.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Button.
Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Feighan with Mr. Mathias of Maryland.
Mr. Edwards of California with Mr. Harrison.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Williams of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Quillen.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Ellberg with Mr. Findley.
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Young with Mr. Wylder.
Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Wyatt.
Mr. Hamilton with Mr. Ruppe.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Nelsen.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Mathias of California.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Pucinski with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Brinkley with Mr. Dow.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss]. If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 920, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is discharged from further consideration of the bill S. 1160.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. STAGGERS

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STAGGERS moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill S. 1160 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 6736, as passed, as follows:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Public Broadcasting Act of 1967'.

"TITLE I—CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

"EXTENSION OF DURATION OF CONSTRUCTION

GRANTS FOR EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING

"SEC. 101. (a) Section 391 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 391) is amended by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: 'There are also authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the purposes of such section, \$10,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, \$12,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.'

"(b) The last sentence of such section is amended by striking out 'July 1, 1968' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1971'.

"MAXIMUM ON GRANTS IN ANY STATE

"SEC. 102. Effective with respect to grants made from appropriations for any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1967, subsection (b) of section 392 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 392(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The total of the grants made under this part from the appropriation for any fiscal year for the construction of noncommercial educational television broadcasting facilities and noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities in any State may not exceed 8½ per centum of such appropriation."

"NONCOMMERCIAL EDUCATIONAL RADIO BROADCASTING FACILITIES

"SEC. 103. (a) Section 390 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 390) is amended by inserting 'noncommercial' before 'educational' and by inserting 'or radio' after 'television'.

"(b) Subsection (a) of section 392 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 392(a)) is amended by—

"(1) inserting 'noncommercial' before 'educational' and by inserting 'or radio' after 'television' in so much thereof as precedes paragraph (1);

"(2) striking out clause (B) of such paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof '(B) in the case of a project for television facilities, the State noncommercial educational television agency or, in the case of a project for radio facilities, the State educational radio agency';

"(3) inserting '(1) in the case of a project for television facilities, after '(D)' and 'noncommercial' before 'educational' in paragraph (1)(D) and by inserting before the semicolon at the end of such paragraph ', or (ii) in the case of a project for radio facilities, a nonprofit foundation, corporation, or association which is organized primarily to engage in or encourage noncommercial educational radio broadcasting and is eligible to receive a license from the Federal Communications Commission; or meets the requirements of clause (1) and is also organized to engage in or encourage such radio broadcasting and is eligible for such a license for such a radio station';

"(4) striking the semicolon at the end of paragraph (1) and adding thereto the following:

"or (E) a municipality which owns and operates a broadcasting facility transmitting only noncommercial programs;"

"(5) striking out 'television' in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of such subsection;

"(6) striking out 'and' at the end of paragraph (3), striking out the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof '; and', and inserting after paragraph (4) the following new paragraph:

"(5) that, in the case of an application with respect to radio broadcasting facilities, there has been comprehensive planning for educational broadcasting facilities and services in the area the applicant proposes to serve and the applicant has participated in such planning, and the applicant will make the most efficient use of the frequency assignment."

"(c) Subsection (c) of such section is amended by inserting '(1)' after '(c)' and 'noncommercial' before 'educational television broadcasting facilities', and by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) In order to assure proper coordination of construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities within each State which has established a State educational radio agency, each applicant for a grant under this section for a project for construction of such facilities in such State, other than such agency, shall notify such agency of each application for such a grant which is submitted by it to the Secretary,

and the Secretary shall advise such agency with respect to the disposition of each such application.

"(d) Subsection (d) of such section is amended by inserting 'noncommercial' before 'educational television' and inserting 'or noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, as the case may be,' after 'educational television broadcasting facilities' in clauses (2) and (3).

"(e) Subsection (f) of such section is amended by inserting 'or radio' after 'television' in the part thereof which precedes paragraph (1), by inserting 'noncommercial' before 'educational television purposes' in paragraph (2) thereof, and by inserting 'or noncommercial educational radio purposes, as the case may be' after 'educational television purposes' in such paragraph (2).

"(f) (1) Paragraph (2) of section 394 of such Act (47 U.S.C. 394) is amended by inserting 'or educational radio broadcasting facilities' after 'educational television broadcasting facilities,' and by inserting 'or radio broadcasting, as the case may be' after 'necessary for television broadcasting'.

"(2) Paragraph (4) of such section is amended by striking out 'The term "State educational television agency" means' and inserting in lieu thereof 'The terms "State educational television agency" and "State educational radio agency" mean, with respect to television broadcasting and radio broadcasting, respectively,' and by striking out 'educational television' in clauses (A) and (C) and inserting in lieu thereof 'such broadcasting'.

"(g) Section 397 of such Act (47 U.S.C. 397) is amended by inserting 'or radio' after 'television' in clause (2).

FEDERAL SHARE OF COST CONSTRUCTION

"SEC. 104. Subsection (e) of section 392 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 392(e)) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Upon approving any application under this section with respect to any project, the Secretary shall make a grant to the applicant in the amount determined by him, but not exceeding 75 per centum of the amount determined by the Secretary to be the reasonable and necessary cost of such project. The Secretary shall pay such amount from the sum available therefor, in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine."

INCLUSION OF TERRITORIES

"SEC. 105. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 394 of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by striking out 'and' and inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and by inserting before the period at the end thereof 'the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands'.

"(b) Paragraph (4) of such section is amended by inserting 'and, in the case of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, means the High Commissioner thereof' before the period at the end thereof.

INCLUSION OF COSTS OF PLANNING

"SEC. 106. Paragraph (2) of section 394 of the Communications Act of 1934 is further amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: 'In the case of apparatus the acquisition and installation of which is so included, such term also includes planning therefor.'

TITLE II—ESTABLISHMENT OF NON-PROFIT EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING CORPORATION

"SEC. 201. Part IV of title III of the Communications Act of 1934 is further amended by—

"(1) inserting

"SUBPART A—GRANTS FOR FACILITIES"

Immediately above the heading of section 390;

"(2) striking out 'part' and inserting in lieu thereof 'subpart' in sections 390, 393, 395, and 396;

"(3) redesignating section 397 as section 398, and redesignating section 394 as section 397 and inserting it before such section 398, and inserting immediately above its heading the following:

"SUBPART C—GENERAL"

"(4) redesignating section 396 as section 394 and inserting it immediately after section 393;

"(5) inserting after 'broadcasting' the first time it appears in clause (2) of the section of such part IV redesignated herein as section 398, or over the Corporation or any of its grantees or contractors, or over the charter or bylaws of the Corporation."

"(6) inserting in the section of such part IV herein redesignated as section 397 the following new paragraphs:

"(6) The term "Corporation" means the Corporation authorized to be established by subpart B of this part.

"(7) The term "noncommercial educational broadcast station" means a television or radio broadcast station, which (A) under the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission in effect on the date of enactment of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, is eligible to be licensed or is licensed by the Commission as a noncommercial educational radio or television broadcast station and which is owned and operated by a public agency or nonprofit private foundation, corporation, or association or (B) is owned and operated by a municipality and which transmits only noncommercial programs for educational purposes.

"(8) The term "interconnection" means the use of microwave equipment, boosters, translators, repeaters, airborne systems, communication space satellites, or other apparatus or equipment for the transmission and distribution of television or radio programs to noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast stations.

"(9) The term "educational television or radio programs" means programs which are primarily designed for educational or cultural purposes and not primarily for amusement or entertainment purposes."

"(7) striking out the heading of such part IV and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"PART IV—GRANTS FOR NONCOMMERCIAL EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING FACILITIES; CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING"

"(8) inserting immediately after the section herein redesignated as section 398 the following:

"EDITORIALIZING AND SUPPORT OF POLITICAL CANDIDATES PROHIBITED"

"SEC. 399. No noncommercial educational broadcasting station may engage in editorializing or may support or oppose any candidate for political office."

"(9) inserting after section 395 the following new subpart:

"SUBPART B—CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING"

"Congressional Declaration of Policy"

"SEC. 396. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares—

"(1) that it is in the public interest to encourage the growth and development of noncommercial educational radio and television broadcasting, including the use of such media for instructional purposes;

"(2) that expansion and development of noncommercial educational radio and television broadcasting and of diversity of its programming depend on freedom, imagination, and initiative on both the local and national levels;

"(3) that the encouragement and support of noncommercial educational radio and television broadcasting, while matters of importance for private and local development,

are also of appropriate and important concern to the Federal Government;

"(4) that it furthers the general welfare to encourage noncommercial educational radio and television broadcast programming which will be responsive to the interests of people both in particular localities and throughout the United States, and which will constitute an expression of diversity and excellence;

"(5) that it is necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to complement, assist, and support a national policy that will most effectively make noncommercial educational radio and television service available to all the citizens of the United States;

"(6) that a private corporation should be created to facilitate the development of educational radio and television broadcasting and to afford maximum protection to such broadcasting from extraneous interference and control.

"Corporation Established"

"(b) There is authorized to be established a nonprofit corporation, to be known as the "Corporation for Public Broadcasting", which will not be an agency or establishment of the United States Government. The Corporation shall be subject to the provisions of this section, and, to the extent consistent with this section, to the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act.

"Board of Directors"

"(c) (1) The Corporation shall have a Board of Directors (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Board"), consisting of fifteen members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than eight members of the board may be members of the same political party.

"(2) The members of the Board (A) shall be selected from among citizens of the United States (not regular full-time employees of the United States) who are eminent in such fields as education, cultural and civic affairs, or the arts, including radio and television; (B) shall be selected so as to provide as nearly as practicable a broad representation of various regions of the country, various professions and occupations, and various kinds of talent and experience appropriate to the functions and responsibilities of the Corporation.

"(3) The members of the initial Board of Directors shall serve as incorporators and shall take whatever actions are necessary to establish the Corporation under the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act.

"(4) The term of office of each member of the Board shall be six years; except that (A) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term; and (B) the terms of office of members first taking office shall begin on the date of incorporation and shall expire, as designated at the time of their appointment, five at the end of two years, five at the end of four years, and five at the end of six years. No member shall be eligible to serve in excess of two consecutive terms of six years each. Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this paragraph, a member whose term has expired may serve until his successor has qualified.

"(5) Any vacancy in the Board shall not affect its power, but shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointments were made.

"Election of Chairman; Compensation"

"(d) (1) The President shall designate one of the members first appointed to the Board as Chairman; thereafter the members of the Board shall annually elect one of their number as Chairman. The members of the Board shall also elect one or more of them as a Vice Chairman or Vice Chairmen.

"(2) The members of the Board shall not, by reason of such membership, be deemed to

be employees of the United States. They shall, while attending meetings of the Board or while engaged in duties related to such meetings or in other activities of the Board pursuant to this subpart be entitled to receive compensation at the rate of \$100 per day including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, equal to that authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5703) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"Officers and Employees

"(e)(1) The Corporation shall have a President, and such other officers as may be named and appointed by the Board for terms and at rates of compensation fixed by the Board. No individual other than a citizen of the United States may be an officer of the Corporation. No officer of the Corporation, other than the Chairman and any Vice Chairman, may receive any salary or other compensation from any source other than the Corporation during the period of his employment by the Corporation. All officers shall serve at the pleasure of the Board.

"(2) Except as provided in the second sentence of subsection (c)(1) of this section, no political test or qualification shall be used in selecting, appointing, promoting, or taking other personnel actions with respect to officers, agents, and employees of the Corporation.

"Nonprofit and Nonpolitical Nature of the Corporation

"(f)(1) The Corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock, or to declare or pay any dividends.

"(2) No part of the income or assets of the Corporation shall inure to the benefit of any director, officer, employee, or any other individual except as salary or reasonable compensation for services.

"(3) The Corporation may not contribute to or otherwise support any political party or candidate for elective public office.

"Purposes and Activities of the Corporation

"(g)(1) In order to achieve the objectives and to carry out the purposes of this subpart, as set out in subsection (a), the Corporation is authorized to—

"(A) facilitate the full development of educational broadcasting in which programs of high quality, obtained from diverse sources, will be made available to noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast stations, with strict adherence to objectivity and balance in all programs of a controversial nature;

"(B) assist in the establishment and development of a system of interconnection to be used for the distribution of educational television or radio programs so that all noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast stations that wish to may broadcast the programs at times chosen by the stations;

"(C) assist in the establishment and development of one or more systems of noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast stations throughout the United States;

"(D) carry out its purposes and functions and engage in its activities in ways that will most effectively assure the maximum freedom of the noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast systems and local stations from interference with or control of program content or other activities.

"(2) Included in the activities of the Corporation authorized for accomplishment of the purposes set forth in subsection (a) of this section, are, among others not specifically named—

"(A) to obtain grants from and to make contracts with individual and with private, State, and Federal agencies, organizations, and institutions;

"(B) to contract with or make grants to program production entities, individuals, and selected noncommercial educational broadcast stations for the production of, and otherwise to procure, educational television or radio programs for national or regional distribution to noncommercial educational broadcast stations;

"(C) to make payments to existing and new noncommercial educational broadcast stations to aid in financing local educational television or radio programming costs of such stations, particularly innovative approaches thereto, and other costs of operation of such stations;

"(D) to establish and maintain a library and archives of noncommercial education television or radio programs and related materials and develop public awareness of and disseminate information about noncommercial educational television or radio broadcasting by various means, including the publication of a journal;

"(E) to arrange, by grant or contract with appropriate public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, or institutions, for interconnection facilities suitable for distribution and transmission of educational television or radio programs to noncommercial educational broadcast stations;

"(F) to hire or accept the voluntary services of consultants, experts, advisory boards, and panels to aid the Corporation in carrying out the purposes of this section;

"(G) to encourage the creation of new noncommercial educational broadcast stations in order to enhance such service on a local, State, regional, and national basis;

"(H) conduct (directly or through grants or contracts) research, demonstrations, or training in matters related to noncommercial educational television or radio broadcasting.

"(3) To carry out the foregoing purposes and engage in the foregoing activities, the Corporation shall have the usual powers conferred upon a nonprofit corporation by the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act, except that the Corporation may not own or operate any television or radio broadcast station, system, or network, or interconnection or program production facility.

"Authorization for Free or Reduced Rate Interconnection Service

"(h) Nothing in the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, or in any other provision of law shall be construed to prevent United States communications common carriers from rendering free or reduced rate communications interconnection services to grantees of or contractors with the Corporation and local noncommercial educational television or radio broadcast stations, subject to such rules and regulations as the Federal Communications Commission may prescribe.

"Report to Congress

"(i) The Corporation shall submit an annual report for the preceding fiscal year ending June 30 to the President for transmittal to the Congress on or before the 31st day of December of each year. The report shall include a comprehensive and detailed report of the Corporation's operations, activities, financial condition, and accomplishments under this section and may include such recommendations as the Corporation deems appropriate.

"Right To Repeal, Alter, or Amend

"(j) The right to repeal, alter, or amend this section at any time is expressly reserved.

"Financing

"(k)(1) There are authorized to be appropriated for expenses of the Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the sum of \$9,000,000, to remain available until expended.

"(2) Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this section, no grant or contract pursuant to this section may provide for payment from the appropriation for the fis-

cal year ending June 30, 1968, for any one project or to any one station of more than \$250,000.

"Records and Audit

"(l)(1)(A) The accounts of the Corporation shall be audited annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by independent certified public accountants or independent licensed public accountants certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State or other political subdivision of the United States. The audits shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the Corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the Corporation and necessary to facilitate the audits shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audits; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

"(B) The report of each such independent audit shall be included in the annual report required by subsection (i) of this section. The audit report shall set forth the scope of the audit and include such statements as are necessary to present fairly the Corporation's assets and liabilities, surplus or deficit, with an analysis of the changes therein during the year, supplemented in reasonable detail by a statement of the Corporation's income and expenses during the year, and a statement of the sources and application of funds, together with the independent auditor's opinion of those statements.

"(2)(A) The financial transactions of the Corporation for any fiscal year during which Federal funds are available to finance any portion of its operation shall be subject to audit by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where accounts of the Corporation are normally kept. The representative of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the Corporation pertaining to its financial transactions and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians. All such books, accounts, records, reports, files, papers and property of the Corporation shall remain in possession and custody of the Corporation.

"(B) A report of each such audit shall be made by the Comptroller General to the Congress. The report to the Congress shall contain such comments and information as the Comptroller General may deem necessary to inform Congress of the financial operations and condition of the Corporation, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as he may deem advisable. The report shall also show specifically any program, expenditure, or other financial transaction or undertaking observed in the course of the audit, which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on or made without authority of law. A copy of each report shall be furnished to the President, to the Secretary, and to the Corporation at the time submitted to the Congress.

"(3)(A) Each recipient of assistance by grant or contract, other than a fixed price contract awarded pursuant to competitive bidding procedures, under this section shall keep such records as may be reasonably necessary to fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds

of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(B) The Corporation or any of its duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance received under this section. The Comptroller General of the United States or any of his duly authorized representatives shall also have access thereto for such purpose during any fiscal year for which Federal funds are available to the Corporation."

"TITLE III—STUDY OF EDUCATIONAL AND INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION BROADCASTING"

"STUDY AUTHORIZED"

"Sec. 301. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to conduct, directly or by contract, and in consultation with other interested Federal agencies, a study of instructional television, including its relationship to educational television broadcasting and such other aspects thereof as may assist in determining whether Federal aid should be provided therefor and the form that aid should take, and which may aid communities, institutions, or agencies in determining whether and to what extent such activities should be used.

"CONTENT OF STUDY"

"Sec. 302. Such study shall be comprehensive in nature and shall cover particularly such items as:

"(1) the quality and content of existing programs and how they can be improved;

"(2) the financial factors involved in use of instructional television in educational institutions;

"(3) the relative advantages or disadvantages of using instructional television as compared with other media;

"(4) the advantages and disadvantages of closed-circuit television;

"(5) the relationship between instructional and educational television; and

"(6) new technology not now available, including flexible teacher-controlled scheduling of programs based on videotapes, discs, films, and other materials or devices.

"DURATION OF STUDY"

"Sec. 303. The study authorized by this title shall be submitted to the President for transmittal to the Congress on or before January 1, 1969.

"APPROPRIATION"

"Sec. 304. There are authorized to be appropriated for the study authorized by this title such sums, not exceeding \$500,000, as may be necessary."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "An Act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of non-commercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facili-

tate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television; and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 6736) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill H.R. 6736 and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 472. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase certain land from Texas Southmost College, Brownsville, Tex.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (H.R. 9547) entitled "An act to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes."

TRIBUTE TO THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to say that in my opinion the House of Representatives owes a great debt of gratitude to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS], to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], the ranking Republican member, and to all of the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. They have brought to a legislative conclusion the consideration of three very important bills within the period of three successive days. I am confident that the entire membership of the House is grateful for the splendid effort which all of the members of this great committee have put forth toward the accomplishment of this purpose.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to add my commendations to those of the gentleman from Oklahoma to these members of the committee who have had such a terribly tough week, and I commend them all for it.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time in order to ask the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] if the gentleman would kindly advise us as to the legislative program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished Republican whip, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], the program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District Day, and there are three bills, as follows:

H.R. 13042, to provide for election of Board of Education of the District of Columbia.

H.R. 8715, to limit the amount of alcoholic beverages which may be brought into the District of Columbia.

H.R. 13025, to permit the District of Columbia Council to make rules and regulations under the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act.

For Tuesday and the balance of the week there will be considered:

H.R. 12120, the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1967, under an open rule with 2 hours of debate.

H.R. 11284, the Fire Research and Safety Act of 1967, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

A joint resolution, making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1968. Mr. Speaker, may I advise the Members that this resolution will be the first legislative matter to be considered on Wednesday next.

H.R. 10673, amendment of Packers and Stockyards Act, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate.

And H.R. 478, establishing procedures to relieve industries and workers injured by imports from low-wage areas, under an open rule with 2 hours of debate.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, this announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time, and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1967

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.